MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Held in Washington, D.C., February 18,1944.

The second meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1944 was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on Friday, February 18, 1944.

The following members were present:

Mr. Clarke, Chairman,
Mr. Lamb,
Dr. Cret,
Mr. Holabird,
Mr. Poor,
Mr. Stackpole,
Mr. Finley,
also H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary

and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the meeting held September 17, 1943, were approved.

2. THEATER OF OPERATIONS MEDALS: The Chairman reported that after the models by Messrs. Weinman, Cecere and Amateis for the Theater of Operations Medals, which were approved by the Commission of Fine Arts on September 17, 1943, were sent to the Secretary of War, a reply was received from him, as follows:

November 25, 1943.

Dear Mr. Clarke:

Reference is made to your memorandum of September 18, 1943, stating that the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on September 17, 1943, selected models submitted by competing sculptors Mr. Gaetano Cecere, Mr. A. A. Weinman, and Mr. Edmond R. Amateis, for the three Theaters of Operations Medals.

The completed plaster models for the three Theaters of Operations Medals have been carefully examined by representatives of the War and Navy Departments and finally rejected as not meeting satisfactorily the requirements envisioned for such medals.

Developments during the war may include some outstanding event, combat action, or decisive victory over the enemy which it will xxx be appropriate and desirable to commemorate and perpetuate in the service medal of each theater. Accordingly, instructions have

been given to The Quartermaster General to suspend further action at this time in securing additional designs or plaster models for these medals.

Inclosed are copies of letters for your file which have been sent to the above sculptors informing them of the non-acceptance of the designs they submitted in competition for the three Theaters of Operations Medals.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON
Secretary of War

(The letter to the sculptors conveyed information similar to that contained in the above letter)

Mr. Clarke said he felt the members of the Commission were not at all impressed with the final result of the competition, using maps for one side of each of the three medals and that it was rather a poor compromise but the best we could get and the official representatives of the War and Navy present at our meetings concurred. Continuing, Mr. Clarke said,

"Before sending the models back to the sculptors I thought it best to have a talk with officers of the General Staff and I attended a conference at the office of Major General White on November 19th last. It was generally admitted at the conference that the competition was premature but then came up the question of payment to the sculptors, who had been at work on the models for fully a year. General White pointed out that there was no contract with the sculptors but indicated his willingness to submit the matter to the Judge Advocate General for an opinion.

"As for another competition, General White agreed that the three sculptors should be given preference, but Captain Patrick, representing the Navy, would not commit that Department. In the meantime the sculptors have been writing to the General Staff requesting payment and General White wrote to me on January 29th about the matter (Exhibit A). I replied by letter of February 5th, a copy of which you have (Exhibit A-1)."

Mr. Holabird remarked, "Col. Nowland was present at our meetings and

he concurred in what the Commission did. You could not get three better sculptors. When the time comes the War Department should say what it wants in the way of a design, and these sculptors would produce good models."

The Chairman remarked that the War Department was careful not to send any letter during the time the models were being made, but there were plenty of witnesses at the meeting to verify what had been done. A copy of a report on the Meeting held November 19th in the Office of Major General White, Assistant Chief of Staff, and a copy of the Memorandum furnished him, consiting of an Extract of the Minutes of the Meetings of the Commission of Fine Arts, on the subject of the Theater of Operations Medals, are attached hereto and made a part of these Minutes (Exhibit B).

3. UNITED STATES TYPHUS COMMISSION MEDAL: The following Memorandum was received from Col. S. Bayne-Jones, Chairman of the United States Typhus Commission:

8 February, 1944.

MEMORANDUM FOR: Mr. Arthur E. Du-Bois, Heraldic Section, Office of the Quartermaster General, Room 1146, Temporary Building A, Washington, D.C.

Subject: Approval of Design of U.S.A. Typhus Commission Medal.

1. Confirming my telephone conversation of last Saturday, I was informed by Mr. Caemmerer that the next meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts will be held at the office of the Commission, Interior Department Building, 18 February. The Commission would like to see the latest models of the Typhus Commission Medal as submitted by Mr.Amateis so that, if possible, a final decision on their acceptance could be made at this time. I told Mr. Caemmerer that the design was satisfactory to the members of the U. S. A. Typhus Commission and that the preliminary models are now in your hands. The U.S.A.Typhus Commission hopes that a decision can be reached in the near future.

2. I will appreciate it if you could send me two photographs of the obverse and reverse of the medal and two copies of both sides of the medal reduced to the size which the medal will have when finished.

S. BAYNE-JONES,
Colonel, Medical Corps,
Director.

The secretary stated that the Office of the Quartermaster General had informed him that the models had been sent to the Office of the General Staff

with request that the models be sent to the Commission of Fine Arts so as to be received by February 18th but that they had not been received to date.

(On February 19th a letter was received from Major General White, stating that the models were being forwarded, and the models were received several days later).

4. "HOFFIE SHOPS": Under date of February 16, 1944, the following letter was received:

Fine Arts Commission,
Room 7000, South Interior Building,
Washington, D.C.

Gentlemen:

In compliance with the request of President Roosevelt, published in the Washington Evening Star on February 10, 1944, to provide "restaurants in communities where the influx of war workers has taxed existing facilities beyond capacity", the "Have-A-Hoffie" Shops request the approval of the Fine Arts Commission to allow the installation of "Have-A-Hoffie" Shops in the District of Columbia.

Each "Have-A-Hoffie" Shop is equipped with a Hoffie Bar that can serve six thousand (6,000) sandwiches every twenty-four hours. It is felt that the "Have-A-Hoffie" Shops is the solution towards relieving and ameliorating the critical eating facilities presently existing in Washington.

One of the most attractive features of the "Have-A-Hoffie" Shops is their portability, i. e., they can readily be moved to a new location should a building be erected on the sites selected for "Have-A-Hoffie" installations.

The two locations for which your approval is urgently requested are the following:

1. Northwest corner of Connecticut Avenue and H Street, N.W.,
and
2. Northeast corner of Sixth and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

If the exact spots on the sites selected by Hoffies are not acceptable to the Commission, any other spot on the same lots will be acceptable.

The "Have-A-Hoffie" Company requests the approval of the Fine Arts Commission to install "Have-A-Hoffie" Shops at the above two locations.

Respectfully yours,
M. Harold Goodman.

The Commission considered the design, which was submitted with the letter, suggesting a yellow porcelain enamel for the exterior and a roof sign. The building is very small, approximately 20' x 12' and 10' high, and accommodating not more than 10 persons at a time; only paper cups and plates used.

The Commission interposed no objection to the erection of the structure

with the following provisos:

1. A white enamel to be used for the exterior;
2. The roof sign to be omitted;
3. The total area of signs on the building not to exceed 25 sq. ft.; no red neon or flashing signs permitted;
4. The building at Sixth Street and Pennsylvania Avenue should preferably be moved back from the Avenue.

A report was sent to Mr. Goodman accordingly (Exhibit C)

5. DESIGN FOR PATTERSON SCHOOL: The Chairman stated that several weeks ago Mr. Nathan C. Wyeth, Municipal Architect, had submitted a design for a new school building, the Patterson School, which had been brought to the attention of the architect members of the Commission and that they approved the design with certain changes, which Mr. Wyeth embodied in the final drawings.

A report was sent to Mr. Wyeth and the Commission concurred in the action taken (Exhibit D).

6. STATUE OF SIR WILLIAM BLACKSTONE: Mr. Harry T. Thompson, Chief of the Planning Division, National Capital Parks, submitted in behalf of the National Park Service a design for the pedestal, embodying suggestions that had been made by Dr. Cret.

The design was considered to be quite satisfactory, and was approved with the suggestion that the molding be removed so as to give the appearance of a simple rectangular block (perpendicular about 5 feet high), resting on a base at least 14' and preferably 18' wide.

A design that had been submitted by Mr. Wyeth suggesting a very low pedestal was not thought suitable for this statue.

7. HISTORICAL WAR MUSEUM; Additional Space for Paintings: Mr. Finley reported that the National Gallery of Art is constantly being called upon to provide space for Exhibitions, and that recently it has been suggested that provision be made for placing on permanent exhibition a collection of paintings

of all wars, owned by the Government, beginning from the time of the American Revolution. For these paintings, Mr. Finley said, he would like to have the old Hadfield Court House at the head of John Marshall Place and near the National Gallery of Art made available when the building will be vacated by the District Courts as is contemplated; that Mr. David Lynn, Architect of the Capitol, who has jurisdiction of the building, is agreeable to this. Mr. Finley said also that certain space could be allowed for plans and models pertaining to the historical development of Washington, as well as space for battle standards; the building to be under the jurisdiction of the National Gallery.

The Commission discussed the matter. Mr. Lamb said, "I think it would be a good thing as you propose. Would it be an exhibition of this War?" Mr.Finley replied, "Of all wars. We propose to have such an exhibition at the National Gallery some time next summer, but what we need is a permanent place for these paintings of all wars." Mr. Lamb then mentioned the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, which has an Exhibition Room, but it was stated that the room is devoted primarily to trophies of World War I.

The Commission concurred in the idea as set forth by Mr. Finley. The Chairman sent a letter to Mr. Lynn accordingly (Exhibit E)

8. "CURATOR"OF PAINTINGS: The Chairman called attention to a letter received from Chief Justice Stone some months ago, as follows:

COPY
Supreme Court of the United States
Washington

October 21, 1943.

My dear Mr. Clarke:

The Supreme Court of the United States, over a period of years, has acquired a collection of oil portraits of its former members, by purchase, gift or loan. While many of these portraits may be of questionable value artistically, historically they merit any care necessary to preserve them as a permanent record of the Court.

Several of these portraits are now sorely in need of varnishing or other minor repairs, and at least one, which was badly restored some years ago, requires a thorough restoration. The Marshal, Mr. Waggaman,

who has charge of our portraits, has tried to have this work done by our local art galleries without result. Failing this, he has sought information as to the proper materials and methods for cleaning and varnishing, but he has succeeded in obtaining only recommendations of artists who might do the work. Unfortunately funds of this type are usually very difficult to obtain.

Mr. Waggaman feels very strongly, and I concur, that the restoration of our portraits and of those in other governmental agencies, which must be in need of similar care, should be done by a competent person. He suggests as a possible solution the appointment of an employee to take care of all government portraits and to be under the immediate supervision of your commission.

Your cooperation in devising a means of preserving these portraits would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
Harlan F. Stone,
Chief Justice of the United States.

The Chairman stated that he assured the Chief Justice that the Commission of Fine Arts would help him carry out the suggestion to have a competent man placed in charge of this work of caring for these portraits, and that he referred the matter to Mr. Finley for a report, at this meeting.

Mr. Finley stated that he discussed the matter with Dr. Abbot and with Dr. Wetmore of the Smithsonian Institution but they are unwilling to request an appropriation of funds to provide for a "Curator" to take care of paintings owned by the Government generally, since the Smithsonian employs a person to take care of its paintings and he would not have time enough to take care of all the other paintings owned by the Government.

Since there are many paintings at the Capitol in charge of Mr. Lynn, who also has charge of the maintenance of the Supreme Court building, Mr.Finley said he talked with Mr. Lynn concerning the matter and that Mr. Lynn has favored the idea of employing a "Curator" under his jurisdiction and that this "Curator" would also take care of the paintings in the "Departments" as well as those in the White House. The sum of $10,000 is being asked from Congress. Mr. Finley said further that Chief Justice Stone has sent a letter to Senator Barkley, Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library on the subject (Exhibit F).

9. MEETING WITH THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE NATIONAL CAPITAL: At 10:30 a.m. a group representing the Joint Committee on the National Capital (organized in 1932 but rather inactive during the past ten years) met with the Commission of Fine Arts to discuss matters relating to the development of the National Capital. The following were present:

Committee Member	Professional Organization
Mr. C. C. Zantzinger, Chairman,	Joint Committee on the National Capital, American Planning and Civic Association.
Mr. Horace W. Peaslee, Vice Chairman,	"
Miss Harlean James, Secretary-Treasurer,	"
Mr. George Hewitt Myers	American Federation of Arts
Mr. D. K. Este Fisher	American Institute of Architects
Mrs. Luis J. Francke	Garden Club of America
Mrs. Gilbert Hitchcock	Garden Club of America
Mr. Markley Stevenson	American Society of Landscape Architects
Mr. Leon Zach	American Society of Landscape Architects
Mr. Auriel Bessemer	National Society of Mural Painters
Mr. Harold M. Lewis	American Society of Civil Engineers
Mr. Paul Opperman	American Institute of Planners
Mr. Harry K. Boss	National Association of Real Estate Boards

A representative of the National Sculpture Society was unavoidably prevented from being present.

The Committee was organized to study and advise on specialized phases in which each organization would be concerned, and in cooperation with the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission to work together so as to achieve in all phases of the development of the National Capital the best that their combined talents and efforts are capable of accomplishing.

Chairman Clarke welcomed the Committee Members, and then proceeded to explain briefly the projects thus far considered at the morning session. The next on the agenda was the---

10. FOURTEENTH STREET BRIDGE PROJECT: Mr. Clarke said that preliminary studies are being made for a new Fourteenth Street Bridge, the location of which he indicated on a map. He said several months ago the National Capital Park and Planning Commission submitted several plot plans suggesting sites for a new bridge; among them was one from the Public Roads Administration recommending two bridges, 500 feet apart, each having four lanes---one bridge would be for out-bound traffic at the site of the present bridge, the other would be on a line with Fourteenth Street for inbound traffic. The Park and Planning Commission is not in favor of this two bridge scheme, preferring a single structure with six traffic lanes at Fourteenth Street and later on another bridge across the river at Alexandria. However, Commissioner MacDonald of the Public Roads Administration, in a forceful letter to Major General Grant (Exhibit G) stated that a bridge at Alexandria would not materially reduce traffic at Fourteenth Street. Commissioner Mac Donald pointed out that within 15 years there will be 5,000 automobiles crossing a bridge in this locality in an hour, due to the enormous increase in traffic brought about by the Pentagon Building, the Shirley Memorial Highway, the Lee Boulevard and the National Airport; also the new bridge should serve to keep buses and much other traffic from the Arlington Memorial Bridge.

It has been shown from traffic counts that an eight lane bridge is necessary but, since a single 8-lane bridge would be more than 125 feet wide, including sidewalks, such a structure would be much too wide for practical purposes,-hence the two-bridge scheme.

A copy of a Memorandum and additional copies of letters in support of the two-bridge scheme are attached hereto and made a part of these Minutes (Exh. G-1).

11. RESOLUTION PERTAINING TO GREAT FALLS: Chairman Clarke called attention to a report that has appeared in newspapers that the U. S. Engineers Office is reviving a scheme to flood the Valley of the Potomac. However, in

the absence of any formal communication concerning this matter he felt the Commission of Fine Arts should not adopt a formal Resolution on the subject at this time; our chief information has been an article written by Miss James that appears in the Washington Star recently. It would be better he thought if the National Capital Park and Planning Commission would make their report first.

Miss James said she wrote the article by request merely to open up the matter and give warning that this thing is going on. Continuing, she said, "Of course we don't know what the decision will be this time. There was strong protest by the American Planning and Civic Association about 15 years ago, as well as by the Park and Planning Commission and the Fine Arts Commission, and it resulted in the Act of Congress of 1928 that thwarted efforts to use the Potomac for Water Power purposes. The present scheme is a renewal of the old one. The citizens of Washington have a special claim to the area comprising the Valley of the Potomac and no matter what the decision of other agencies of the Government may be, we of the American Planning and Civic Association would be opposed to any attempt to mar this natural scenery. In fact it is a matter of National interest, since any dam of this sort would affect the National Capital. At its Board meeting yesterday, the American Planning and Civic Association adopted a Resolution in opposition to the dam, and converting the Valley of the Potomac to Water Power purposes."

After further discussion it was generally agreed that a Resolution by the Commission of Fine Arts could be held in abeyance for the present.

12. ADDITIONAL PROJECTS FOR WASHINGTON OF INTEREST TO THE COMMITTEE ON THE NATIONAL CAPITAL: Chairman Clarke thereupon called attention to a number of pending projects for the information of the Committee:

(a) Development of East Capitol Street. This scheme has been made by a group of architects and others over a long period of years. The Public Roads

Administration two or three years ago became interested in the traffic of the District of Columbia and placed the matter in charge of their District Engineer, Mr. Swain, who asked two persons to make a study of a possible solution of the development of East Capitol Street. This was done with the full knowledge and support of the Planning Commission and this Commission.

The idea of the Public Roads Administration is to get adequate means to expedite traffic. This study was made and the Planning Commission made further studies. The interest of the Commission of Fine Arts has particularly to do with the new public buildings. In that connection, the Army decided to erect their Army Medical Museum and Library on the square east of the Folger Library. They have an important collection and a valuable library. The idea has been to widen East Capitol Street and retain two rows of elms; then widen Constitution and Independence Avenues with the idea of placing minor buildings along those Avenues and fine marble and granite buildings down East Capitol Street. The Folger Library has been built to conform to the new building line and Eggers and Higgins, architects of New York, have made a preliminary plan for the Army Medical Museum and Library. It is a development as you will notice from the Plan of the city that appears as an extension of the Mall eastward. This is in accordance with the Plan of L'Enfant, who expected that the city would first develop eastward.

To expedite traffic the East Capitol Street Plan provides for tunneling Capitol Hill along the lines of Constitution and Independence Avenues.

(b) Pan American Annex: This is Scheme O, which shows the Annex and a Plaza in front of the South Interior Building. All members of the Special Committee appointed by the President approved it except the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. The scheme requires legislation by Congress to authorize changing some of the streets in this locality.

(c) Federal Reserve Annex: This building is to be built on the north side of C Street, flanked on the east by the New Interior Building and on the west by the first unit of the new War Department Building, both of which are limestone buildings. Thus it is quite evident that the buildings adjacent to this square (at the intersection of New York and Virginia Avenues) should all be in limestone and the Commission of Fine Arts decided accordingly for the Annex building designed by Dr. Cret. A delegation of Congressmen was present at one of our meetings who urged the use of marble. The Commission listened to what they had to say and then decided on limestone. However, when the Commission informed them that all buildings on East Capitol Street are to be granite or marble they seemed satisfied, because we have not heard further about the matter.

(d) J. Q. A. Ward Statue of George Washington and John Marshall Statue: Senator Brewster wants the statue of Chief Justice Marshall on the west Terrace of the Capitol moved to the U. S. Supreme Court; this leaves a vacant space and the Commission favor placing there a statue of George Washington by J.Q.A. Ward, that is, a copy of the one in front of the old SubTreasury in New York. It has been cast by the Gorham Bronze Works, of Providence, and is of particular interest to Senator Green of Rhode Island. Congress has authorized legislation for these statues but has not made an appropriation available. It seems a project that will have to wait until after the War.

(e) Design for Monuments in Arlington National Cemetery: Mr. Clarke said that this matter has been before the Commission for a long period of years,

particularly the design of officers' monuments. Mr. Moore discussed the matter frequently, and back in 1918 the Commission adopted a few designs that have been more or less followed by the Office of the Quartermaster General. It is coming to the point, however, where they need revision. I am in favor of a flat stone.

Mr. Peaslee said this matter would seem to be one in which the Joint Committee on the National Capital could be of real help in contacting the granite and marble men. He said for a period of about 15 years after 1920 he had urged flat stones in certain areas of Fort Lincoln Cemetery and found that the granite and marble firms were not opposed to the idea. A landscape architect is needed to supervise landscape matters in Arlington.

Mr. Zantzinger said, "The matter Mr. Peaslee has touched upon is of interest. I think it is generally accepted that the great Cemetery Companies have preferred flat stones actually on the ground because they keep the beauty of the surrounding country and yet provide a memorial. Now if the commercial companies have found this satisfactory, I think it would be a simple matter to take up the same scheme for Arlington and show that flat stones are preferable to a great forest of monuments. There is no reason why an officer should have a great monument and a private only a marker. Both types should be of uniform size. Arlington should be preserved as a great Park, more particularly since Arlington is to be increased considerably over its present size.

It was thought that the Vermont Marble Company and the Georgia Marble Company should be consulted; and also that the Garden Club of America could be of real help in this matter.

Chairman Clarke stated that Arlington National Cemetery is under the immediate jurisdiction of Colonel R. P. Harbold, Chief of the Memorial Branch, Office of the Quartermaster General, War Department.

(f) Enlarging Arlington National Cemetery: The Chairman called attention to Senate Bill S.413, which passed the United States Senate on July 3,1943, under which Arlington National Cemetery is to be enlarged by 118 acres, so as to take in all the available land from the Cemetery north to the Lee Boulevard and eastward to include the Agricultural Department Experimental Farm area to the Potomac, as well as a fringe of ground to the south and west of the Cemetery. This farm was designated by General Somervell for the Pentagon building, until the President of the United States directed that he move the building three-fourths of a mile South. For the present temporary dormitories have been built on the farm area. By including this extra land it will prevent apartment buildings from being erected adjacent to Arlington Cemetery, a thing that was attempted several times in the past two years.

(g) Landscape Architect for the District of Columbia Government: Mr.Peaslee urged the appointment of a Landscape Architect for the District of Columbia Government, who would give particular attention to street parking. He said it would be a great help to this city. There is nothing gained in simply dragging people into the courts for violating traffic regulations. The landscape architect would in a sense be responsible for the appearance of streets and he should have some authority in parking matters. Mr. Peaslee said there are 2,000 acres of street parking which should be placed under the jurisdiction of a Municipal Landscape Architect.

13. DESIGNS FOR BRIDGES: Mr. Harry T. Thompson submitted in behalf of the National Park Service designs for---

(a) A bridge on Naylor Road.

(b) A bridge at Camp Springs Airport terminal, Maryland.

Major Clarke inspected the designs and on his recommendation the Commission approved them.

14. PAINTING OF POCAHONTAS: Under date of February 7, 1944, a Memorandum was received from Miss Grace G. Tully, Private Secretary to the President, together with a photograph of the painting and a letter from Mrs. Charles E. Greenough, as follows:

The University Club, 1 West 54th St.
Jan. 24, 1944.

My dear President Roosevelt:

My attention has been so arrested by a painting which I saw today at the Grand Central Art Galleries that I am writing you to suggest that it would be a priceless addition to America's official collection. It is the most perfect and graphic depiction of any historical event which I have seen in my years of painting research. Under separate cover I am sending you a copy of it---which I begged from the artist---telling him that I thought the proper person in Washington would surely be sent by you to investigate. The title is Capt. John Smith's life being saved by Pocahontas in 1607, which took place near Williamsburg, Virginia.

It would be a pity if this rare Americana should be bought by someone living in Painted Post Arizona or similar parts! I always feel dear President Roosevelt that I have to reidentify myself each time I have occasion to write to you, as old Anno Domini is moving so rapidly and your kalidescopic life "rates" a little reminding, that I am the widow of Captain Franck Taylor Evans and the mother of Natalie Wales Latham, founder of "Bundles for Britain". In any event, when you have seen the copy of the Leigh painting, I hope that you will wish to have something done about it before it is too late.

With best thoughts,

Ever sincerely,
Enid S. Greenough,
(Mrs. Charles E. Greenough)

P.S. I have just learned that the Leigh collection will be moved the end of next week, so I do hope a committee could see it while it is in New York. E. S. G.

The Commission inspected the photograph and decided that in their

opinion the painting does not have such artistic merit as to warrant its purchase by the Government. Also, the Commission took note of the fact that no funds are available to purchase the portrait, and a report was sent to Mrs. Greenough accordingly (Exhibit H).

15. WORLD WAR II CEMETERIES: Chairman Clarke stated that a notice appeared in the Press a few days ago that the War Department proposes a World War Cemetery for this War in each of the 48 States of the Union. He said the Commission of Fine Arts gave much assistance in planning, at the request of the War Department, the permanent American Cemeteries in Europe. However, this time it is proposed to bring all our World War II dead back to the United States and provide appropriate cemeteries in the States for them. The Commission of Fine Arts is to help in the designs for these Cemeteries, and the Commission agreed that such assistance as is possible would be given.

(The Washington Star of February 15, 1944, contained an Associated Press dispatch on the subject above mentioned, quoting from House of Representatives Report No.1118, on the War Department Civil Functions Appropriation Bill, fiscal year, 1945, page 3, as follows:

> "It will be necessary in the not distant future to provide additional burial areas for the interment of the remains of soldiers. The committee understands that there presently is being processed through appropriate channels in the War Department a proposition looking to the provision of a very considerable number of additional national cemeteries, which, if and when approved and financed, would mean at least one national cemetery in each of the several States and one or more additional ones in the more populous States where the burial demands are heaviest."

16. FREER GALLERY OF ART PURCHASES: The Commission visited the Freer Gallery of Art and inspected several objects of art submitted by the Director for purchase. The Commission approved them (Exhibit I).

17. SCULPTURE FOR THE WAR DEPARTMENT BUILDING: The following letter was received from Mr. Edward B. Rowan, Assistant Chief, Section of Fine Arts:

February 15, 1944.

Dear Mr. Clarke:

Reference is made to your letter of September 18, 1943, commenting on the full-size models of two proposed sculpture figures by Mr. Henry Kreis for the additional decoration of the lobby of the War Department Building, Washington, D.C.

In the letter referred to above it was stated that from the photographs the Commission did not feel that these figures would add sufficiently to the decoration of the building to warrant approval of the Commission. An elevation drawing was requested and the suggestion was made that a group of two or three figures might solve the problem more satisfactorily.

In view of this last suggestion being contrary to the views of the architect of the building, who is now out of the country, it will be appreciated if you will allow me the privilege of presenting the elevation drawing and reviewing the case in person with the Commission or the sculptor member thereof during the meeting in Washington on February 18.

Thanking you for all past courtesies, I am,

Very cordially yours,
Edward B. Rowan.

Arrangements were made for Mr. Rowan to submit the sketch above-mentioned to the Commission, while at the Freer Gallery of Art. Mr. Rowan said that Mr. Kreis has been at work on these figures for a long time and feels that his reputation is at a stake, since his group of figures had been approved for the exterior of the War Department building at 21st Street and Virginia Avenue, but now finds it impossible to carry out the scheme of group figures for the interior, as had been recommended by the Commission, to flank the mural painting, through lack of adequate funds. Mr. Rowan said that Mr. Dewey Foster, architect of the building, favors the idea of placing single figures on corbels rather than on pedestals.

The Commission considered the matter. The Chairman felt the architect's recommendation might be good but should not necessarily be followed, since the Commission of Fine Arts exists to advise on such matters. Mr. Stackpole felt

greatly disappointed that the scheme of group figures cannot be carried out.

Mr. Rowan said that, since the necessary money is not available, he would like to proceed on the basis of one figure for each side of the painting.

After discussion, it was decided that Mr. Kreis should bring his plaster models to Washington and set them in place for inspection by the Commission at the next meeting (Exhibit J).

The Commission adjourned at 5:00 p.m. After leaving the Freer Gallery of Art the Commission inspected the Hadfield Court House and felt it would well serve the purposes of a Historical War Museum.

Also the Commission visited the National Gallery of Art and were shown by Director Finley an interesting Exhibition of Paintings and Drawings entitled "The Army at War", executed by American Artists in the various War Theaters.

In the evening a Dinner was given at the Mayflower Hotel under the auspices of the Joint Committee on the National Capital, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts, at which particular attention was given to problems relating to the Future Washington as pertaining to Post War problems. Among the speakers was Chairman Clarke, who stressed aesthetics in the further development of the National Capital. This was in accord with the desire of President Roosevelt, as expressed in a letter from him, which was read (Exhibit K).

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON

February 5, 1944.

Dear General White:

I have received your letter of January 29th, concerning the models submitted by Messrs. Weinman, Cecere and Amateis for the Theater of Operations Medals.

I am pleased to note that you have decided to submit the matter to The Judge Advocate General for an opinion, after receiving additional information from an officer not now in Washington, who was assigned to represent the War Department in this matter. I gave you a complete copy of our Record at the meeting in your office on November 19, 1943; there is no additional data available. From this Record you will note that while originally models for these medals were submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts in behalf of the War Department by Colonel Hugh B. Hester, Office of the Quartermaster General, the War Department conducted a second competition pursuant to a letter sent to Colonel Nowland under date of September 21, 1942, with a view toward securing more satisfactory designs and models. Further developments were attended to in conference with representatives of the War and Navy Departments, and no action was taken without their verbal concurrence.

While I fully realize that the War Department has no legal obligation to the sculptors, because they were not under contract, I nevertheless feel that the Department is morally obligated to pay the sculptors for their work

by reason of the implications on the part of duly authorized representatives of your office who agreed with the members of the Commission of Fine Arts that, in the circumstances, the results produced in the form of four models were as satisfactory as could be obtained. At the meeting in your Office on November 19, 1943, I emphasized the fact that the War Department has a moral obligation to the three sculptors and you agreed to submit the matter to the Judge Advocate General's Office for an opinion.

The Commission of Fine Arts made it known to the sculptors, early in the competition, that the Commission's decision was not final but that the final decision would be made by the War Department.

The Commission of Fine Arts recommended the scheme of providing maps of each of the three Theaters of Operations only after a representative of your Office, Colonel L. H. Hanley, and a representative of the Navy Department, Captain H. G. Patrick, had concurred in the idea (See Minutes of Meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts, May 21, 1943--page 15 of Memorandum). This we realized was not a commitment on the part of the War and the Navy Departments, but it was our judgment that these gentlemen acted to the full limit of their responsibilities.

The statements contained in this letter are more in line with my understanding of my conversation with you on November 19th last than are the statements in the first paragraph of your letter.

I am sending copies of this letter to Messrs. Weinman, Cecere, and Amateis.

Sincerely yours,

Major General M. G. White,
Assistant Chief of Staff,
War Department,
Washington, D. C.

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Cahirman.

WAR DEPARTMENT
WAR DEPARTMENT GENERAL STAFF
PERSONNEL DIVISION G-1
WASHINGTON

January 29, 1944.

Mr. Gilmore D. Clarke, Chairman,
Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Clarke:

Reply to your letter of January 8 has been delayed while we attempted to piece together the whole story with respect to the proposed theater of operations medals. I am sure you will recall that at our meeting on November 19, I specifically asked you if, in your opinion, any official representative of either the War or Navy Departments had made any actual or implied commitment to any of the sculptors, and whether, in your opinion, the War Department was technically or morally bound to remunerate them. You assured me that in your opinion there had been no commitment by either department, that everything that had been done had been on the initiative of the Fine Arts Commission, and that you recognized that the Commission was without authority to commit either department. The letters that I wrote to the three sculptors were written at your suggestion and along the lines that you indicated.

Apparently none of the sculptors concerned understood the situation as you described it to me, nor do they agree with your view that neither department made any actual or implied commitment. As I stated to you, if there was an actual, even though unauthorized, commitment by an official of the War Department, I will endeavor to find some way by which these gentlemen may be reimbursed at least for the actual expenses they incurred. So far, I can find nothing of record in the War Department to indicate that there was ever any official indication of our acceptance of these designs or any War Department approval of the action taken by the Commission in having these three sculptors perform the extra work that they did. The only officer who was directly connected with the matter at the time is no longer on duty in Washington, and I have written him for a full statement of his recollection of the events that transpired. I am also continuing our search of our own files and shall appreciate it if you will now give me a summary of what actually transpired in the Fine Arts Commission. As soon as all the data is available, I will submit the matter to The Judge Advocate General for a decision as to whether or not the War Department is obligated, and what payment, if any, can be made.

All three sculptors are apparently under the impression that the Fine Arts Commission has the authority to give final approval of designs of this nature, and they seem to feel that because they did certain things at your request, the War and Navy Departments are thereby obligated. Pending completion of my investigation of the matter, I shall appreciate it if you will inform these gentlemen correctly in the matter. For their information, and in order that they may understand what is being done, I am sending each of them a copy of this letter.

Sincerely yours,

M. G. WHITE
Major General
Assistant Chief of Staff.

Exhibit A

MEMORANDUM FOR: The Commission of Fine Arts.

Subject

Models for the Theater of Operations Medals

Early in November, 1943, Col. H. A. Cooney, Chief of the Miscellaneous Branch, General Staff, War Department, telephoned and stated that the joint Committee on Decorations of the War and the Navy Departments recently held a meeting at which the models for the Theater of Operations medals by Messrs. Weinman, Cecere, and Amateis, approved by the Commission of Fine Arts on September 17th, were considered and that it was decided not to accept them and to return the models to the sculptors. He said that the Joint Committee was not satisfied with maps for one side of each of these medals; some criticism was also made in certain matters of detail.

This action is drastic, in view of the fact that the sculptors spent fully a year completing these models, in cooperation with officers of the General Staff. The Secretary suggested holding the models until a meeting could be arranged with appropriate officers of the Army and the Navy and Chairman Clarke; this was held during Friday, the 19th. The appointment was made for 3:00 p.m.

November 19, 1943.

A meeting was held in the office of Major General M. G. White, Assistant Chief of Staff, G-1, on the subject above menticned attended by the following:

Major General M. G. White, Assistant Chief of Staff, G-1,
Col. H. A. Cooney, Chief, Miscellaneous Division, General Staff,
Col. R. W. Berry, Executive Officer, G-1,
Col. L. A. Gunther, G-1,
Mr. Arthur E. DuBois, Chief of the Heraldic Division,
representing the Office of the Quartermaster General,
Capt. H. G. Patrick, Chief, Bureau of Personnel, Navy Dept.,
Mr. Gilmore D. Clarke, Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts,
Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary, Commission of Fine Arts.

Major General White opened the discussion by stating that he had not been informed as to the procedure taken during the past year with reference to the models for the Theater of Operations Medals, and that it appeared that officers of his staff had acted without proper authority. He felt that the Program of Competition, conducted by the War Department somewhat over a year ago, was held much too soon. General White wanted to know, in particular, by what authority Messrs. Weinman, Cecere, and Amateis were selected as the "winners of the competition".

EXHIBIT B

MEMORANDUM FOR: The Commission of Fine Arts.

Subject

Models for the Theater of Operations Medals

Early in November, 1945, Col. H. A. Cooney, Chief of the Miscellaneous Branch, General Staff, War Department, telephoned and stated that the Joint Committee on Decorations of the War and the Navy Departments recently held a meeting at which the models for the Theater of Operations medals by Messrs. Weinman, Deseye, and Aretsis, approved by the Commission of Fine Arts on September 17th, were considered and that it was decided not to accept them and to return the models to the sculptors. He said that the Joint Committee was not satisfied with more for one side or each of these medals; some criticism was also made in certain matters of detail.

This action is drastic, in view of the fact that the sculptors spent fully a year completing these models, in cooperation with officers of the General Staff. The Secretary suggested holding the models until a meeting could be arranged with appropriate officers of the Army and the Navy and Chairman Clarke; this was held during Friday, the 16th. The appointment was made for 3:00 p.m.

November 14, 1945.

A meeting was held in the office of Major General M. G. White, Assistant Chief of Staff, G-1, on the subject above mentioned attended by the following:

Major General M. G. White, Assistant Chief of Staff, G-1,
Col. H. A. Cooney, Chief, Miscellaneous Division, General Staff,
Col. R. W. Berry, Executive Officer, G-1,
Col. I. A. Gunther, G-1,
Mr. Arthur E. DuBois, Chief of the Heraldic Division,
representing the Office of the Quartermaster General,
Capt. H. C. Patrick, Chief, Bureau of Personnel, Navy Dept.,
Mr. Gilmore D. Clarke, Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts,
Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary, Commission of Fine Arts.

Major General White opened the discussion by stating that he had not been informed as to the procedure taken during the past year with reference to the models for the Theater of Operations Medals, and that it appeared that officers of his staff had acted without proper authority. He felt that the Program of Competition, conducted by the War Department somewhat over a year ago, was held much too soon. General White wanted to know, in particular, by what authority Messrs. Weinman, Deseye, and Aretsis were selected as the "winners of the competition".

Chairman Clarke then explained in general the practice of the Commission of Fine Arts, during more than thirty years, with reference to models submitted; that the aim is to secure a competent sculptor, as well as a medallist, and then aim to secure a medal that would be satisfactory to the War Department. In this instance the sketches (in the form of drawings), received in response to the first competition conducted by the War Department, were considered by the Commission at a meeting held September 19, 1942. Col. B. E. Nowland and Col. L. H. Hanley of the General Staff were present and took part in the discussion. It was decided that "the designs indicated a lack of a full comprehension of the problem involved", and that another competition should be held. This was held by the War Department, based upon a program drafted by the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, and all who took part in the first competition and several additional sculptors were invited to compete. Four Theaters of Operations were reduced to three, namely for the American, European-African-Middle Eastern, and Asiatic-Pacific Theater of Operations.

The models (in plaster) submitted in response to this second competition were considered by the Commission of Fine Arts at a meeting held January 29, 1943, Col. L. H. Hanley, representing Colonel B. E. Nowland of the General Staff, being present, and the following were selected by the Commission of Fine Arts as the sculptors for the three medals:

Mr. Gaetano Cecere for the American Theater of Operations Medal,
Mr. A. A. Weinman for the European-African-Middle Eastern Theater of Operations Medal,
Mr. Edmond Amateis, for the Asiatic-Pacific Theater of Operations Medal.

Col. Nowland was informed of these "Awards" by letter from the Commission of Fine Arts dated January 30, 1943.

Chairman Clarke stated that the Commission made these awards with the distinct understanding that, before acceptance by the Army, the designs must meet with the approval of the Secretary of War. A number of details in connection

Chairman Clarke then explained in general the practice of the Commission
of Fine Arts, during more than thirty years, with reference to models submitted,
that the aim is to secure a competent sculptor, as well as a realistic, and
often aim to secure a model that would be satisfactory to the War Department.
In this instance the sketches (in the form of drawings), received in response
to the first competition conducted by the War Department, were considered by
the Commission at a meeting held September 15, 1942. Col. J. E. Howland and
Col. L. H. Hanley of the General staff were present and took part in the
discussion. It was decided that "the destine indicated a lack of a full
comprehension of the problem involved", and that another competition should
be held. This was held by the War Department, based upon a program drafted
by the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, and all who took part in the
first competition and several additional sculptors were invited to compete.
Four Theaters of Operations were reduced to three, namely for the European,
European-African-Middle Eastern, and Asiatic-Pacific Theater of Operations.

The models (in plaster) submitted in response to this second competition
were considered by the Commission of Fine Arts at a meeting held January 29,
1943, Col. L. H. Hanley, representing Colonel J. E. Howland of the General Staff,
being present, and the following were selected by the Commission of Fine Arts
as the sculptors for the three models:

Mr. Gaetano Cesare for the American Theater of Operations Medal,
Mr. A. A. Heinman for the European-African-Middle Eastern Theater of
Operations Medal,
Mr. Edmond Amateis, for the Asiatic-Pacific Theater of Operations Medal.

Col. Howland was informed of these "Awards" by letter from the Commission
of Fine Arts dated January 30, 1943.

Chairman Clarke stated that the Commission made these awards with the
distinct understanding that, before acceptance by the Army, the designs must meet
with the approval of the Secretary of War. A number of details in connection

with these models received attention at subsequent meetings of the Commission, namely on March 21 and on May 21, 1943. At one of these meetings Capt. H. G. Patrick, representing the Navy, was present and concurred in the use of maps for the obverse or reverse, as may be determined later.

At this point the Secretary, with the approval of the Chairman, presented to General White an extract of the Minutes of the Commission pertaining to these medals; a copy of this extract is attached hereto and made a part of this report.

General White expressed regret that so much work had been done on the models, and said that if the War Department was obligated to pay the sculptors a ruling would have to be obtained from the Judge Advocate General, since the Quartermaster General could pay the sculptors only pursuant to the acceptance of the models by the Secretary of War after appropriate contracts for the production of the medals had been executed.

Major General White reported that the Navy Department seems to prefer one Victory Medal of a design to be determined later, perhaps commemorating one outstanding event of the War, and added "I am inclined to agree." He was at a loss to know what to do other than to suspend action in the case.

Chairman Clarke stated that while he fully appreciates that no legal obligation exists on the part of the War Department to pay the three sculptors, there is nevertheless a definite moral obligation since the officers of the General Staff, duly appointed to act in the matter, were kept fully informed every step of the way in the production of the models. He added that, if action is to be suspended, he felt the three sculptors should be definitely designated to design these or other medals for the Army and Navy, and that the amount of the stipend should be materially increased to cover the work

with these medals received attention at subsequent meetings of the Commission, namely on March 21 and on May 21, last. At one of these meetings Capt. E. C. Patrick, representing the Navy, was present and concurred in the use of maps for the obverse or reverse, as may be determined later.

At this point the Secretary, with the approval of the Chairman, presented to General White an extract of the Minutes of the Commission pertaining to these medals; a copy of this extract is attached hereto and made a part of this report.

General White expressed regret that so much work had been done on the models, and said that if the War Department was obliged to pay the sculptors a ruling would have to be obtained from the Judge Advocate General, since the Quartermaster General could pay the sculptors only pursuant to the acceptance of the models by the Secretary of War after appropriate contracts for the production of the medals had been executed.

Major General White reported that the Navy Department seems to prefer one Victory Medal of a design to be determined later, perhaps commemorating one outstanding event of the War, and added "I am inclined to agree." He was at a loss to know what to do other than to suspend action in the case.

Chairman Clarke stated that while he fully appreciates that no legal obligation exists on the part of the War Department to pay the three sculptors, there is nevertheless a definite moral obligation since the officers of the General Staff, duly appointed to act in the matter, were kept fully informed every step of the way in the prosecution of the models. He added that, if action is to be suspended, he felt the three sculptors should be definitely designated to design these or other medals for the Army and Navy, and that the amount of the stipend should be materially increased to cover the work

accomplished to date and for which they may receive no compensation. Capt. Patrick declined to commit the Navy Department to such an agreement; but General White thought that it might be understood that these sculptors should receive preference in the design of other medals at some future date. Mr. DuBois, representing the Quartermaster General, stated that it would be difficult to increase the honorarium for the separate medals since $1500.00 was the amount customarily paid to sculptors for each medal.

It was thereupon understood that the appropriate officer of the General Staff notify each of the three sculptors that the War Department has suspended action in the matter relating to designs for medals for the three Theater of Operations and that the models be returned.

Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman

H. P. Caemmerer,

Secretary

accomplished to date and for which they may receive no compensation.

Capt. Patrick declined to commit the Navy Department to such an agreement; but General White thought that it might be understood that these sculptors should receive preference in the design of other medals at some future date.

Mr. DuBois, representing the Quartermaster General, stated that it would be difficult to increase the honorarium for the separate medals since $1500.00 was the amount customarily paid to sculptors for each medal.

It was thereupon understood that the appropriate officer of the General Staff notify each of the three sculptors that the War Department has suspended action in the matter relating to designs for medals for the three Theater of Operations and that the models be returned.

Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman

H. P. Caemmerer,

Secretary

"THEATER OF OPERATIONS" MEDALS, WAR DEPARTMENT: At a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts held on September 19, 1942, Colonel B. E. Nowland of the General Staff submitted designs and models for proposed "Theater of Operations" Medals. Colonel Nowland and Colonel Hanley were present and took part in the discussion.

Colonel Nowland said that there is no great hurry about these medals since an Executive Order to issue these medals has not as yet been signed by the President. In view of the fact that millions of the medals will be needed, (involving an expenditure of perhaps three or four million dollars), it will probably be necessary to postpone action to strike the medals until after the War in view of the lack of metal until that time.

Designs and models for these medals were received from the following sculptors:

WAR DEPARTMENT
Office of the Quartermaster General
Washington

SPQRR 421
(Service Medals) August 29, 1942.

MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Designs for Service Medals for the Combat Theatres.
TO: Assistant Chief of Staff, G-1.
Attention: Colonel Nowland

1. In accordance with letter about August 4, 1942 requesting designs for service medals for the Combat Theatres, there are transmitted under separate cover designs submitted by various sculptors as follows:

Mr. Edmond Amateis - Inclosures 1, 2 and 3
Mr. G. Cecere - Inclosures 4 and 5
Mr. Anthony D. Francisci - Inclosures 6 to 11 inclusive
Mr. Chester Beach - Inclosure 12
Mr. Ulrich Ellerhusen - Inclosures 13 to 17 inclusive
Mr. C. P. Jennewein - Inclosures 18 to 22 inclusive
Mr. T. Jones - Inclosure 23
Mr. T. A. Rovelstad - Inclosures 24 to 27 inclusive

"THEATRE OF OPERATIONS" MEDALS, WAR DEPARTMENT: At a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts held on September 18, 1942, Colonel E. B. Dowland of the General Staff submitted designs and models for proposed "Theater of Operations" medals. Colonel Dowland and Colonel Manley were present and took part in the discussion.

Colonel Dowland said that there is no great hurry about these medals since an Executive Order to issue these medals has not as yet been signed by the President. In view of the fact that millions of the medals will be needed, (involving an expenditure of perhaps three or four million dollars), it will probably be necessary to postpone action to cast the medals until after the War in view of the lack of metal until that time.

Designs and models for these medals were received from the following sculptors:

Office of the Quartermaster General
Washington

SPQMR 421
(Service Medals) August 29, 1942.

SUBJECT: Designs for Service Medals for the Combat Theaters.
TO: Assistant Chief of Staff, G-1.

Attention: Colonel Dowland

1. In accordance with letter dated August 4, 1942 requesting designs for service medals for the Combat Theaters, there are transmitted under separate cover designs submitted by various sculptors as follows:

Mr. Edmond Amateis - Inclosures 1, 2 and 3
Mr. G. Geare - Inclosures 4 and 5
Mr. Anthony P. Francisci - Inclosures 6 to 11 inclusive
Mr. Chester Beach - Inclosure 12
Mr. Ulrich Ellerhusen - Inclosures 13 to 17 inclusive
Mr. C. P. Jennewein - Inclosures 18 to 22 inclusive
Mr. T. Jones - Inclosure 23
Mr. T. A. Rovelstad - Inclosures 24 to 27 inclusive

2. The Correspondence transmitting the various designs are inclosed as follows:

Mr. Anthony D. Francisci - Inclosure 28
Mr. Chester Beach - Inclosure 29
Mr. Ulrich Ellerhusen - Inclosure 30
Mr. T. Jones - Inclosure 31.

3. It is suggested that these designs be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts for their advice prior to selecting a final design and approval thereof.

For the Quartermaster General:

HUGH B. HESTER,
Colonel, Q. M. C.,
Assistant

31 Inclosures:
Inclosures 1 to 27 inclusive:
Designs (Under separate cover)
Inclosures 28 to 31 inclusive:
Correspondence (Herewith).

The Commission felt that the designs indicated a lack of a full comprehension of the problem involved which was reflected in the sameness in a number of the sketches for these medals. Colonel Nowland said the War Department itself is somewhat uncertain about the border line of some of these combat areas; that in the first World War of 1917-18 all the American soldiers went to Europe but in this War they are being sent to all parts of the world. At present there are four great theaters of operations: American, European, African, and Asiatic-Pacific.

After discussion the Commission reached the following conclusions:

1. That the competitors who have already submitted designs for these medals be advised that the judgment has been postponed until a later date in order to give each sculptor more time for study and to permit others to submit designs in accordance with a detailed program of competition.

2. The Correspondence transmitting the various designs are inclosed as follows:

Mr. Anthony D. Fremstad - Inclosure 28
Mr. Chester Beach - Inclosure 29
Mr. Hirton Allerhusen - Inclosure 30
Mr. T. Jones - Inclosure 31.

3. It is suggested that these designs be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts for their advice prior to selecting a final design and approval thereof.

For the Quartermaster General:

HUGH B. HESTER,
Colonel, G. M. C.,
Assistant

31 Inclosures:
Inclosures 1 to 27 inclusive:
Designs (Under separate cover)
Inclosures 28 to 31 inclusive:
Correspondence (Herewith).

The Commission felt that the designs indicated a lack of a full comprehension of the problem involved which was reflected in the smallness in a number of the sketches for these medals. Colonel Howland said the War Department itself is somewhat uncertain about the border line of some of these combat areas; that in the First World War of 1917-18 all the American soldiers went to Europe but in this War they are being sent to all parts of the world. At present there are four great theatres of operations: American, European, African, and Asiatic-Pacific.

After discussion the Commission reached the following conclusions:

1. That the competitors who have already submitted designs for these medals be advised that the judgment has been postponed until a later date in order to give each sculptor more time for study and to permit others to submit designs in accordance with a detailed program of competition.

2. That the medalists or sculptors who have already submitted designs should be given the opportunity to add to or to revise their designs and to submit new ideas if they so desire. The designs already submitted should be retained, unless the competitor requests that they be returned. If not returned, they will be judged with the drawings submitted later.

3. That after the new designs have all been received by the War Department, this Commission will meet to review them and to make specific recommendations after conference with Colonel Nowland.

4. That at least one month be given to all competitors and that the designs be submitted on white paper mounted on board, as specified in the program, except that designs already submitted will be accepted in the manner in which they have been presented and without prejudice with respect to the method of presentation. While it would be desirable to have all designs submitted as models in plaster, it appears impractical, in this case, to require more than drawings in order to be fair to those who have already made submissions. Hereafter submissions for medals should be in plaster as may be specified later.

5. It is further suggested that all those who were invited to submit designs in the competition for the Air Corps Medal be invited to present designs for all four, or for any one, two, or three of the Theater of Operations medals.

6. It is suggested that, in addition to those medalists invited to submit designs for the Air Corps Medal, the following named be invited:-

Mr. Paul Manship
319 East 72nd Street, New York
Mr. Leo Friedlander
P. O. Box 572, White Plains, N. Y.

2. That the medallists or sculptors who have already submitted designs should be given the opportunity to add to or to revise their designs now to submit new ideas if they so desire. The designs already submitted should be retained, unless the competitor requests that they be returned. If not returned, they will be judged with the drawings submitted later.

3. That after the new designs have all been received by the War Department, this Commission will meet to review them and to make specific recommendations after conference with Colonel Howland.

4. That at least one month be given to all competitors and that the designs be submitted on white paper mounted on board, as specified in the program, except that designs already submitted will be accepted in the manner in which they have been presented and without prejudice with respect to the method of presentation. While it would be desirable to have all designs submitted as models in plaster, it appears impractical, in this case, to require more than drawings in order to be fair to those who have already made submissions. Hereafter submissions for medals should be in plaster or may be specified later.

5. It is further suggested that all those who were invited to submit designs in the competition for the Air Corps Medal be invited to present designs for all four, or for any one, two, or three of the Theater of Operations medals.

6. It is suggested that, in addition to those medallists invited to submit designs for the Air Corps Medal, the following named be invited:-

Mr. Paul Manship
319 East 72nd Street, New York

Mr. Leo Friedlander
P. O. Box 572, White Plains, N. Y.

Mr. Heinz Warneke
5 Washington Mews, New York
Mr. Henry Kreis
Essex, Connecticut
Mr. Robert Howard
521 Francisco Street
San Francisco, California
Mr. Frederick Olmsted
310 Filbert Street
San Francisco, California
Mr. Sargent C. Johnson
2101 Scott Street
Berkeley, California
Miss Berta Margoulies
333 Fourth Avenue, New York
Mr. Raymond Barger
36 East 23rd Street, New York

Also the Chairman drafted a program of competition in which the Commission concurred. This and a letter were sent as a report to Colonel Nowland. (Exhibit F).

(In view of report from Colonel Nowland that sculptors are to be allowed additional time for designs of this medal, the Chairman requested of Colonel Nowland that the sculptors be asked to submit plaster models. (Exhibit F-1). Colonel Nowland informed the Secretary on September 26 that the sculptors will be asked to submit models and will be allowed two months for same).

September 21, 194[illegible]

Re: Four "Theater of Operations" Medals

Dear Colonel Nowland:

Following our meeting of Saturday last, I discussed with the members of the Commission the problems incident to securing appropriate and satisfactory designs for these important medals. As a result of these deliberations, I make the following suggestions, which appear to be fair to the competitors and at the same time provide the most satisfactory and effective means for securing designs appropriate in the circumstances.

1. That the competitors who have already submitted designs for these medals be advised that the judgment has been postponed until a later date in order to give each sculptor more time for study and to permit others to submit designs in accordance with a detailed program which is outlined in a statement attached to this letter.

2. That the medalists or sculptors who have already submitted designs should be given the opportunity to add to or to revise their designs and to submit new ideas if they so desire. The designs already submitted should be retained, unless the competitor requests that they be returned. If not returned, they will be judged with the drawings submitted later.

3. That after the new designs have all been received by the War Department, this Commission will meet to review them and to make specific recommendations after conference with you.

4. That at least one month be given to all competitors and that the designs be submitted on white paper mounted on board, as specified in the program, except that designs already submitted will be accepted in the manner in which they have been presented and without prejudice with respect to the method of presentation. While it would be desirable to have all designs submitted as models in plaster, it appears impractical, in this case, to require more than drawings in order to be fair to those who have already made submissions. Hereafter submissions for medals should be in plaster as may be specified later.

5. It is further suggested that all those who were invited to submit designs in the competition for the Air Corps Medal be invited to present designs for all four, or for any one, two, or three of the Theater of Operations medals.

6. It is suggested that, in addition to those medalists invited to submit designs for the Air Corps Medal, the following named be invited:-

September 21, 1942

Re: Four "Theater of Operations" medals

Dear Colonel Howland:

Following our meeting of Saturday last, I discussed with the members of the Commission the problems involved to securing appropriate and satisfactory designs for these important medals. As a result of these deliberations, I make the following suggestions, which appear to be fair to the competitors and at the same time provide the most satisfactory and effective means for securing designs appropriate in the circumstances.

1. That the competitors who have already submitted designs for these medals be advised that the Judgment has been postponed until a later date in order to give each sculptor more time for study and to permit others to submit designs in accordance with a detailed program which is outlined in a statement attached to this letter.

2. That the medallists or sculptors who have already submitted designs should be given the opportunity to add to or to revise their designs and to submit new ideas if they so desire. The designs already submitted should be retained, unless the competitor requests that they be returned. If not returned, they will be judged with the drawings submitted later.

3. That after the new designs have all been received by the War Department, this Commission will meet to review them and to make specific recommendations after conference with you.

4. That at least one month be given to all competitors and that the designs be submitted on white paper mounted on board, as specified in the program, except that designs already submitted will be accepted in the manner in which they have been presented and without prejudice with respect to the method of presentation. While it would be desirable to have all designs submitted as models in plaster, it appears impractical, in this case, to require more than drawings in order to be fair to those who have already made submissions. Hereafter submissions for medals should be in plaster as may be specified later.

5. It is further suggested that all those who were invited to submit designs in the competition for the Air Corps medal be invited to present designs for all four, or for any one, two, or three of the Theater of Operations medals.

6. It is suggested that, in addition to those medallists invited to submit designs for the Air Corps medal, the following names be invited:-

Mr. Paul Manship
319 East 72nd Street, New York
Mr. Leo Friedlander
P. O. Box 572, White Plains, N. Y.
Mr. Heinz Warneke
5 Washington Mews, New York
Mr. Henry Kreis
Essex, Connecticut
Mr. Robert B. Howard
521 Francisco Street
San Francisco, California
Mr. Frederick Olmsted
310 Filbert Street
San Francisco, California
Mr. Sargent C. Johnson
2101 Scott Street
Berkeley, California
Miss Berta Margoulies
333 Fourth Avenue, New York
Mr. Raymond Barger
36 East 23rd Street, New York

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman

Colonel B. E. Nowland
G-1, General Staff
War Department
Washington, D. C.

Enclosure - Suggested program for competition
for four Theater of Operations Medals.

Mr. Paul Mansbip
319 East 72nd Street, New York
Mr. Leo Friedlander
P. O. Box 572, White Plains, N. Y.
Mr. Heinz Warneke
5 Washington Mews, New York
Mr. Henry Kreis
Essex, Connecticut
Mr. Robert B. Howard
521 Francisco Street
San Francisco, California
Mr. Frederick Olmsted
310 Filbert Street
San Francisco, California
Mr. Sargent C. Johnson
2101 Scott Street
Berkeley, California
Miss Berta Margoulies
355 Fourth Avenue, New York
Mr. Raymond Berger
35 East 23rd Street, New York

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman

Colonel B. E. Howland
G-1, General Staff
War Department
Washington, D. C.

Enclosure - Suggested program for competition
for four Theater of Operations Medals.

SUGGESTED PROGRAM FOR A COMPETITION FOR THE SELECTION OF FOUR MEDALS FOR THE FOUR PRINCIPAL THEATERS OF OPERATIONS IN THIS WAR

American Theater)
(Suggest adding a brief description of the limits of each theater.
European Theater)
African Theater)
Asiatic-Pacific Theater)

1. The medals in bronze, _____ inches in diameter, shall consist of an obverse and a reverse. Each competitor may submit more than one design for each medal or for two or more medals. A sculptor may be awarded commission to carry out one or more of his designs.

2. The reverse shall be the same for all medals. Sculptors may submit one or more designs for the reverse. It is understood that one sculptor may be awarded a commission to carry out one or more of his designs for the obverse and one design for the reverse. Other sculptors may be awarded one or two and up to three designs for the obverse. The Army reserves the right to make all awards,- four designs for the obverse of four medals and one design for the reverse of four medals,- to one sculptor; or the right to award one or more obverse and a reverse to one sculptor and one, two, or three designs for the obverse to one sculptor. The U. S. Army reserves the right to have the design of a reverse and an obverse on any one medal by different sculptors. The compensation in each case will be fifteen hundred dollars for each medal, whether or not the reverse is included.

3. Designs shall be submitted as follows:-

Not more than two designs shall be submitted on one piece of white paper mounted on board in size 12" x 18". Designs shall be placed one over the other so that the long dimension is vertical. Each design shall be 6" in diameter and presented in any medium. One mount may have two obverse or one obverse and one reverse design or a single obverse design.

4. The name and address of the competitor shall be plainly marked on the back of each mount. For purposes of judgment, an identifying number will be placed on the face of the mount by others.

5. The only lettering on the obverse will be the description of the particular theater as indicated in the list at the heading of this program; for example, "American Theater". The reverse shall provide lettering as follows:- (a) United States of America; (b) space for two dates.

6. Care should be exercised in the use and development of symbolism. The several theaters of operation are so large and include such broad geographic limitations that a distinctive emblem representing a single country may not symbolize a whole theater. For example, the kangaroo of Australia is not symbolic of the Far East-Pacific Theater, since China and the Philippine Islands are included.

7. Designs already submitted by competitors on _____, will be held and judged with designs to be submitted by others and without prejudice because of any lack of observance of the regulations with respect to size of drawing, etc., as outlined herein. Competitors who have submitted designs may add to or revise them. Designs already submitted will be returned only

SUGGESTED PROGRAM FOR A COMPETITION FOR THE SELECTION
OF FOUR MEDALS FOR THE FOUR PRINCIPAL THEATERS
OF OPERATIONS IN THIS WAR

American Theater)
)
European Theater) Suggest adding a
) brief description
African Theater) of the limits of
) each theater.
Asiatic-Pacific Theater)

1. The medals in bronze, _____ inches in diameter, shall consist of an obverse and a reverse. Each competitor may submit more than one design for each medal or for two or more medals. A sculptor may be awarded commission to carry out one or more of his designs.

2. The reverse shall be the same for all medals. Sculptors may submit one or more designs for the reverse. It is understood that one sculptor may be awarded a commission to carry out one or more of his designs for the obverse and one design for the reverse. Other sculptors may be awarded one or two and up to three designs for the obverse. The Army reserves the right to make all awards,- four designs for the obverse of four medals and one design for the reverse of four medals,- to one sculptor; or the right to award one or more obverse and a reverse to one sculptor and one, two, or three designs for the obverse to one sculptor. The U. S. Army reserves the right to have the design of a reverse and an obverse on any one medal by different sculptors. The compensation in each case will be fifteen hundred dollars for each medal, whether or not the reverse is included.

3. Designs shall be submitted as follows:-

Not more than two designs shall be submitted on one piece of white paper mounted on board in size 12" x 18". Designs shall be placed one over the other so that the long dimension is vertical. Each design shall be 6" in diameter and presented in any medium. One mount may have two obverse or one obverse and one reverse design or a single obverse design.

4. The name and address of the competitor shall be plainly marked on the back of each mount. For purposes of judgment, an identifying number will be placed on the face of the mount by others.

5. The only lettering on the obverse will be the description of the particular theater as indicated in the list at the heading of this program, for example, "American Theater". The reverse shall provide lettering as follows:- (a) United States of America; (b) space for two dates.

6. Care should be exercised in the use and development of symbolism. The several theaters of operation are so large and include such broad geographic limitations that a distinctive emblem representing a single country may not symbolize a whole theater. For example, the kangaroo of Australia is not symbolic of the Far East-Pacific Theater, since China and the Philippine Islands are included.

7. Designs already submitted by competitors on _____, will be held and judged with designs to be submitted by others and without prejudice because of any lack of observance of the regulations with respect to size of drawing, etc., as outlined herein. Competitors who have submitted designs may add to or revise them. Designs already submitted will be returned only

upon request to _____, _____. If designs are resubmitted, they must comply with the provision of this program.

8. Drawings must be mailed to _____, _____, and placed in the mail not later than midnight of _____, 1942.

9. Accepted drawings will become the property of the U. S. Army. All other drawings will be returned to the competitors.

10. The successful sculptor or sculptors will be required to prepare a plaster model for each accepted design; this will be used as the basis for the preparation of the dies for the casting of the medals. The plaster models will be 8" in diameter and not less than 1½" in total thickness. They will be delivered as directed. The sculptor will assume all responsibility for the arrival of the models in good condition.

(EXHIBIT F)

upon request to _____, _____. If designs are resubmitted,
they must comply with the provision of this progra_.

8. Drawings must be mailed to _____, _____, and
placed in the mail not later than midnight of _____, 19__.

9. Accepted drawings will become the property of the U. S. Army.
All other drawings will be returned to the competitors.

10. The successful sculptor or sculptors will be required to prepare a
plaster model for each accepted design; this will be used as the basis for
the preparation of the dies for the casting of the medals. The plaster
models will be 8" in diameter and not less than 1½" in total thickness. They
will be delivered as directed. The sculptor will assume all responsibility
for the arrival of the models in good condition.

(OVER)

September 25, 1942

Dear Colonel Nowland:

Mr. Caemmerer has reported that you look with favor upon the suggestion to extend the program for the "Theaters of Operation" medal to be conducted somewhat along the line indicated in the program which accompanied my recent letter to you on this subject.

Mr. Caemmerer stated further that you have indicated that a period as long as six weeks may be allowed the competitors for the designs submitted in this competition. That being the case, I suggest that the War Department call for the submission of sketch models in plaster, instead of drawings. These plaster models should be not less than six inches in diameter and not less than one inch thickness over-all. It seems to me that the results will be much more satisfactory, since most sculptors are better able to work in the medium of clay and plaster than in pencil or crayon. This suggestion is not my own. It was made by one of the most eminent medalists and sculptors in this country, and I am sure that his ideas on this subject are shared by a large majority of those who will be asked to enter this competition.

I wish to assure you that we desire to be of the greatest possible assistance to you in matters of this character.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke
Chairman

Colonel B. E. Nowland
G-1, General Staff
War Department
Washington, D. C.

(EXHIBIT F-1)

Dear Colonel Howland:

Mr. Cammerer has reported that you look with favor upon the suggestion to extend the program for the "Masters of Sculpture" medal to be conducted somewhat along the lines indicated in the program which accompanied my recent letter to you on this subject.

Mr. Cammerer stated further that you have indicated that a period as long as six weeks may be allowed the competitors for the designs submitted in this competition. That being the case, I suggest that the Department call for the submission of sketch models in plaster, instead of drawings. These plaster models should be not less than six inches in diameter and not less than one inch thickness over-all. It seems to me that the results will be much more satisfactory, since most sculptors are better able to work in the medium of clay and plaster than in pencil or crayon. This suggestion is made by me only. It was made by one of the most eminent medalists and sculptors in this country, and I am sure that his ideas on this subject are shared by a large majority of those who will be asked to enter this competition.

I wish to assure you that we desire to be of the greatest possible assistance to you in matters of this character.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke
Chairman

Colonel E. E. Howland
U.S. General Staff
War Department
Washington, D. C.

(PWC 1-17 E-1)

THEATER OF OPERATIONS MEDALS: At a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts held January 29, 1943, the War Department submitted 46 models from fifteen different sculptors, that had been received in response to a competition for the proposed Theater of Operations Medals. The object of the competition was to secure a design for each of three Theater of Operations Medals, namely the obverse, and one reverse to be used on each of the three medals. The models were considered anonymously, and after careful consideration the following were chosen;

1. American Theater of Operations: The Commission chose the design submitted by Gaetano Cecere, of St. Louis, Mo., which was described by him as follows:

> Obverse, American Theater:
> The combined forces of North and South America are depicted with swords in hands, and shields symbolic of unity in defense. A map of North and South America designates location.

The sketch model was incomplete, and Mr. Cecere was requested to develop his idea further and submit another model (10 inches in diameter) for inspection by the Commission. It was suggested that the lower sword be expressed in full length. Also the Commission suggested a wider spacing of the letters, which should be read from the inside and from left to right. A letter was sent to Mr. Cecere accordingly.

2. European - African - Middle Eastern Theater of Operations: The Commission chose the design submitted by Mr. Adolph A. Weinman, of Forest Hills, Long Island, New York, showing an American eagle (which he had submitted for the obverse) for the reverse of the three medals. The reverse, showing a flaming sword, was selected for the obverse of this medal, subject to some further study by Mr. Weinman, appropriate legend and lettering. Mr. Weinman was informed accordingly.

THEATER OF OPERATIONS MEDALS: At a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts held January 29, 1943, the War Department submitted 45 models from fifteen different sculptors, that had been received in response to a competition for the proposed Theater of Operations Medals. The object of the competition was to secure a design for each of three Theater of Operations Medals, namely the obverse, and one reverse to be used on each of the three medals. The models were considered anonymously, and after careful consideration the following were chosen:

1. American Theater of Operations: The Commission chose the design submitted by Gaetano Cecere, of St. Louis, Mo., which was described by him as follows:

Obverse, American Theater:
The combined forces of North and South America are depicted with swords in hands, and shields symbolic of unity in defense. A map of North and South America designates location.

The sketch model was incomplete, and Mr. Cecere was requested to develop his idea further and submit another model (10 inches in diameter) for inspection by the Commission. It was suggested that the lower sword be expressed in full length. Also the Commission suggested a wider spacing of the letters, which should be read from the inside and from left to right. A letter was sent to Mr. Cecere accordingly.

2. European - African - Middle Eastern Theater of Operations: The Commission chose the design submitted by Mr. Adolph A. Weinman, of Forest Hills, Long Island, New York, showing an American eagle (which he had submitted for the obverse) for the reverse of the three medals. The reverse, showing a flaming sword, was selected for the obverse of this medal, subject to some further study by Mr. Weinman. Improvements in design and lettering. Mr. Weinman was informed accordingly.

3. Asiatic - Pacific Theater of Operations: The Commission chose the design submitted by Mr. Edmond Amateis, of Brewster, New York.

Colonel L. H. Hanley, representing Colonel B. E. Nowland of the General Staff, War Department, was present during the latter part of the period in which the Commission had the models under consideration, and concurred in the conclusions reached.

The Commission felt that the competition should be considered one to choose three sculptors who are thoroughly competent to prepare designs that would meet with the approval of the War Department and the Commission of Fine Arts, rather than to choose the specific designs submitted in the competition. Thus if circumstances should require, the sculptors would be requested to submit additional models. However, the Commission took note of the fact that the sculptors selected are thoroughly competent and outstanding medallists, and their ability to produce a design and model that ultimately would be satisfactory was not questioned.

Colonel Hanley said that there is no hurry in this matter, as it is not proposed to award these medals until after the close of the War. Until then also it would be impossible to get the metal needed for millions of these medals that would be struck.

A report was sent to Colonel Nowland, as follows:

January 30, 1943.

Dear Colonel Nowland: Submissions of sketch models for Theater of Operations Medals.

The Commission of Fine Arts, in session on January 29th, received a total of forty-six separate submissions from fifteen sculptors, who entered a competition for three Theater of Operations Medals, held under the auspices of the War Department. One box was found to be empty; evidently this box was broken open in transit to the War Department and the contents lost.

After a careful review of all of the models, the Commission made a choice of four: three designs for the obverse of each of three medals and one reverse. They are as follows:

1. American Theater of Operations: The Commission chose the design submitted by Mr. Gaetano Cecere, of St. Louis, Mo.

3. Asiatic - Pacific Theater of Operations: The Commission chose the design submitted by Mr. Raymond Amateis, of Brewster, New York.

Colonel L. H. Hanley, representing Colonel B. E. Lovell of the General Staff, War Department, was present during the latter part of the period in which the Commission had the models under consideration, and concurred in the conclusions reached.

The Commission felt that the competition should be considered one to choose three sculptors who are thoroughly competent to prepare designs that would meet with the approval of the War Department and the Commission of Fine Arts, rather than to choose the specific designs submitted in the competition. Thus if circumstances should require, the sculptors would be requested to submit additional models. However, the Commission took note of the fact that the sculptors selected are thoroughly competent and outstanding medallists, and their ability to produce a design and model that ultimately would be satisfactory was not questioned.

Colonel Hanley said that there is no hurry in this matter, as it is not proposed to award these medals until after the close of the War. Until then also it would be impossible to get the metal needed for millions of these medals that would be struck.

A report was sent to Colonel Rowland, as follows:

January 30, 1943.

Dear Colonel Rowland:

The Commission of Fine Arts, in session on January 30th, received a total of forty-six separate submissions from fifteen sculptors, who entered a competition for three Theater of Operations medals, held under the auspices of the War Department. One box was found to be empty; evidently this box was broken open in transit to the War Department and the contents lost.

After a careful review of all of the models, the Commission made a choice of four: three designs for the obverse of each of three medals and one reverse. They are as follows:

1. American Theater of Operations: The Commission chose the design submitted by Mr. Gaetano Cecere, of St. Louis, Mo.

2. European - African - Middle Eastern Theater of Operations: The Commission chose the design submitted by Mr. Adolph A. Weinman, of Forest Hills, Long Island, New York, for the reverse of the medals.

3. Asiatic - Pacific Theater of Operations: The Commission chose the design submitted by Mr. Edmond Amateis, of Brewster, New York.

Colonel L. H. Hanley of your office was present during the latter part of the period in which the Commission discussed the relative merits of the several submissions and concurred in the final conclusions. The Commission emphasized that it is desirable to consider the competition, one to choose three sculptors who are thoroughly competent to prepare designs to meet with the approval of the War Department and the Commission, rather than to choose the specific designs submitted in the competition. In other words, if the first designs do not meet with approval the sculptors may be asked to submit an additional sketch or sketches after discussing the subject matter with you. The Commission are confident that each one of the sculptors, whose models were chosen from those submitted, are thoroughly competent and outstanding medalists, anxious to make further studies if that becomes necessary. The Commission therefore suggest the appointment of Messrs. Weinman, Amateis, and Cecere as medallists to carry out three commissions as hereinbefore outlined in this letter.

With Colonel Hanley's approval, the Commission is arranging to ask Mr. Cecere to delineate his submission (American Theater of Operations) at a larger scale and in more detail; Mr. Weinman to make such revisions as may be appropriate in consideration of the suggested changes in the two designs submitted by him. As soon as these have been received, I shall communicate with you again.

Let me assure you that the Commission feel that it will be possible to obtain eminently satisfactory results through the further development of the models chosen from those three sculptors.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Colonel B. E. Nowland,
G-1, Military Intelligence,
War Department,
Washington, D. C.

Gilmore D. Clarke

At a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts held on March 19, 1943, further attention was given to this matter:

(a) Mr. A. A. Weinman, sculptor, submitted a revised model for the obverse of the European-African-Middle Eastern Theater of Operations Medal, showing a Flaming Sword, and one for the reverse of all three Theater of Operations Medals, in accordance with recommendations made by the Commission of Fine Arts in a letter to Colonel Nowland of the General Staff, dated

2. European - African - Middle Eastern Theater of Operations: The Commission chose the design submitted by Mr. Adolph A. Weinman, of Forest Hills, Long Island, New York, for the reverse of the medal.

3. Asiatic - Pacific Theater of Operations: The Commission chose the design submitted by Mr. Edmond Amateis, of Irvington, New York.

Colonel I. H. Hanley of your office was present during the latter part of the period in which the Commission discussed the relative merits of the several submissions and concurred in the final conclusions. The Commission emphasized that it is desirable to consider the competition, one to choose three sculptors who are thoroughly competent to prepare designs to meet with the approval of the War Department and the Commission, rather than to choose the specific designs submitted in the competition. In other words, if the first designs do not meet with approval the sculptors may be asked to submit an additional sketch or sketches after discussing the subject matter with you. The Commission are confident that each one of the sculptors, whose medals were chosen from those submitted, are thoroughly competent and outstanding medallists, anxious to make further studies if that becomes necessary. The Commission therefore suggests the appointment of Messrs. Weinman, Amateis, and Decore as medallists to carry out three commissions as hereinbefore outlined in this letter.

With Colonel Hanley's approval, the Commission is arranging to ask Mr. Decore to delineate his submission (American Theater of Operations) at a larger scale and in more detail; Mr. Weinman to make such revisions as may be appropriate in consideration of the suggested changes in the two designs submitted by him. As soon as these have been received, I shall communicate with you again.

Let me assure you that the Commission feel that it will be possible to obtain eminently satisfactory results through the further development of the models chosen from those three sculptors.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Colonel B. E. Howland,
G-1, Military Intelligence,
War Department,
Washington, D. C.

Gilmore D. Clarke

At a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts held on March 18, 1944,

further attention was given to this matter:

(a) Mr. A. A. Weinman, sculptor, submitted a revised model for the

obverse of the European-African-Middle Eastern Theater of Operations Medal,

showing a Flaming Sword, and one for the reverse of all three Theater of

Operations Medals, in accordance with recommendations made by the Commission

of Fine Arts in a letter to Colonel Howland of the General Staff, dated

January 30, 1943. Mr. Weinman sent the following letter with his models:

Dear Mr. Clarke:

I have sent you today under separate cover one photograph each of the obverse and reverse for the European-African-Middle Eastern Theater of Operations Medal and one small print showing the medal at 1 1/4" diameter, with the inscriptions changed, as suggested by the Commission. The lettering appears slightly fuller than it will appear on the final reduction, it being my experience that lettering has a tendency towards a slight shrinking in the reduction from the large model. If these finished models have the final approval of the Commission and the War Department, an intermediate reduction of the Eagle side will have to be made before final reduction to medal size of 1 1/4". The obverse showing Flaming Sword can be made in one operation.

I have forwarded the finished models by Railroad Express to Mr. Caemmerer on March 5th.

Sincerely yours,
A. A. Weinman.

The Commission thought that Mr. Weinman had made excellent models and approved them. The Commission concurred in his suggestions as made in the letter above quoted.

Colonel L. H. Hanley of the General Staff was present and said that some criticism had been made as to using the eagle on the reverse, but he was shown a medal of the Marine Corps which established the precedent; in fact the Navy Department has a die for using this eagle on the reverse of its medals. The secretary stated that the eagle was modeled by Mr. Weinman and adopted by the Navy Department several years ago for this purpose. A letter was sent to Colonel Hanley approving the models, as follows:

March 24, 1943.

Dear Colonel Hanley:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on March 19, 1943, approved the revised models submitted by Mr. A. A. Weinman, sculptor, for:

(a) the European-African-Middle Eastern Theater of Operations Medal; and

(b) the obverse of all three Theater of Operations Medals.

January 30, 1943. Mr. Weinman sent the following letter with his models:

Dear Mr. Clarke:

I have sent you today under separate cover one photograph each of the obverse and reverse for the European-African-Middle Eastern Theater of Operations Medal and one small print showing the medal at 1 1/4" diameter, with the inscriptions changed, as suggested by the Commission. The lettering appears slightly fuller than it will appear on the final reduction, it being my experience that lettering has a tendency toward a slight shrinking in the reduction from the large model. If these finished models have the final approval of the Commission and the War Department, an intermediate reduction of the Eagle side will have to be made before final reduction to medal size of 1 1/4". The obverse showing Flaming Sword can be made in one operation.

I have forwarded the finished models by Railroad Express to Mr. Casmerer on March 30th.

Sincerely yours,

A. A. Weinman.

The Commission thought that Mr. Weinman had made excellent models and approved them. The Commission concurred in his suggestions as made in the letter above quoted.

Colonel L. H. Hanley of the General Staff was present and said that some criticism had been made as to using the eagle on the reverse, but he was shown a medal of the Marine Corps which established the precedent; in fact the Navy Department has a die for using this eagle on the reverse of its medals. The secretary stated that the eagle was modeled by Mr. Weinman and adopted by the Navy Department several years ago for this purpose. A letter was sent to Colonel Hanley approving the models, as follows:

March 24, 1943.

Dear Colonel Hanley:

The Commission of FineArts at their meeting on March 18, 1943, approved the revised models submitted by Mr. A. A. Weinman, sculptor, for:

(a) the European-African-Middle Eastern Theater of Operations Medal; and

(b) the obverse of all three Theater of Operations Medals.

In submitting the models, Mr. Weinman stated:

> "The lettering appears slightly fuller than it will appear on the final reduction, it being my experience that lettering has a tendency towards a slight shrinking in the reduction from the lerge model. If these finished models have the final approval of the Commission and the War Department, an intermediate reduction of the Eagle side will have to be made before final reduction to medal size of 1¼". The obverse showing the Flaming Sword can be made in one operation."

The Commission concur in this matter.
For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Colonel L. H. Hanley,
G-1, Military Intelligence,
War Department,
Washington, D. C.

(b) Mr. Gaetano Cecere submitted a plaster model for the obverse of the American Theater of Operations Medal. The design consisted of the representation of a relief map of North and South America protected by sword and shield. Dr. Cret suggested that the hilts of the two swords be similar and show a guard. The Commission concurred in this and also recommended that the contours of the relief map be somewhat more sharply defined. A letter was sent to Mr. Cecere accordingly.

Colonel Hanley suggested giving further study to the question of design for the Asiatic-Pacific Theater of Operations medal, since, he said, the Navy Department is not satisfied with it. The Chairman stated that he would bring the matter to the attention of the sculptor, Mr. Amateis.

American Theater of Operations: At a meeting held May 21, 1943, the Commission of Fine Arts inspected a revised model for the American Theater of Operations Medal received from Gaetano Cecere, which embodied suggestions made by the Commission at the meeting on March 19th. The Commission considered the model well done.

In submitting the models, Mr. Heinman stated:

"The lettering appears slightly fuller than it will appear on the final reduction, it being my experience that lettering has a tendency toward a slight shrinking in the reduction from the large model. If these finished models have the final approval of the Commission and the War Department, an intermediate reduction of the medals size will have to be made before final reduction to medal size of 1½". The obverse showing the Flaming Sword can be made in one operation."

The Commission concurs in this matter.
For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Colonel L. H. Hanley,
G-2, Military Intelligence,
War Department,
Washington, D. C.

(b) Mr. Gaetano Cecere submitted a plaster model for the obverse of the American Theater of Operations Medal. The design consisted of the representation of a relief map of North and South America protected by sword and shield. Mr. Orel suggested that the hilts of the two swords be similar and allow a guard. The Commission concurred in this and also recommended that the contours of the relief map be somewhat more sharply defined. A letter was sent to Mr. Cecere accordingly.

Colonel Hanley suggested giving further study to the question of design for the Asiatic-Pacific Theater of Operations medal, since, he said, the Navy Department is not satisfied with it. The Chairman stated that he would bring the matter to the attention of the sculptor, Mr. Ametis.

American Theater of Operations: At a meeting held May 21, 1942, the Commission of Fine Arts inspected a revised model for the American Theater of Operations Medal received from Gaetano Cecere, which embodied suggestions made by the Commission at the meeting on March 12th. The Commission considered the model well done.

Asiatic-Pacific Theater of Operations: The Commission considered two alternate models received from Edmond Amateis for the Asiatic-Pacific Theater of Operations Medal. One showed a shield of the United States as defending the area; and the other a broken branch of a Japanese Cherry Tree. Attention was also called to the original model submitted by Mr. Amateis of a Japanese Masque, which had been very well done, but it was understood that it was not acceptable to the Navy Department.

The Commissicn discussed the merits of these models with Colonel L. H. Hanley of the General Staff, War Department, and with Captain H. G. Patrick, Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department. It was decided that, while Mr. Weinman's model of an eagle was appropriate as a symbolic figure to represent the United States of America on one side of each of the three medals, the symbolism portrayed in the other casts was not satisfactory. Furthermore it was thought that the recipient of a medal would appreciate for the other side of his medal a map showing the geographical area in which he served during World War II. Messrs. Weinman, Cecere, and Amateis were thereupon requested to submit another model accordingly.

At a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts held on September 17, 1943, the secretary reported that during the past three months Messrs. Cecere, Weinman, and Amateis had given much time and attention to making a revised model for each of the three "Theater of Operations" in which American soldiers, sailors and marines are fighting, comprising the entire world, and that each of these sculptors had now submitted a model of a map made in accordance with instructions received by them, for their respective areas, as follows:

American Theater of Operations Medal, by Mr. Cecere;

European-African-Middle Eastern Theater of Operations Medal, by Mr. Weinman;

Asiatic-Pacific Theater of Operations: The Commission considered two alternate models received from Admiral Ingersoll for the Asiatic-Pacific Theater of Operations medal. One showed a conical or pagoda roof defending the area; and the other a broken branch of a cherry tree. Attention was also called to the original model submitted by Mr. Amateis of a Japanese lantern, which had been very well done, but it was understood that it was not acceptable to the Navy Department.

The Commission discussed the merits of these models with Colonel I. H. Hanley of the General Staff, War Department, and with Captain H. G. Patrick, Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department. It was decided that, while Mr. Heinman's model of an eagle was appropriate as a symbolic figure to represent the United States of America on one side of each of the three medals, the symbolism portrayed in the other case was not satisfactory. Furthermore it was thought the recipient of a medal would appreciate for the other side of his medal a map showing the geographical area in which he served during World War II. Therefore, Messrs. Deering, and Amateis were thereupon requested to submit another model accordingly.

At a meeting of the Commission on Fine Arts held on September 17, 1942, the secretary reported that during the past three months Messrs. Deering, Heinman, and Amateis had given much time and attention to making a revised model for each of the three "Theaters of Operations" in which American soldiers, sailors and marines are fighting, comprising the entire world, and that each of these sculptors had now submitted a model of a map made in accordance with instructions received by them, for their respective medal, as follows:

American Theater of Operations medal, by Mr. Deering:

European-African-Middle Eastern Theater of Operations medal, by Mr. Heinman:

Asiatic - Pacific Theater of Operations Medal, by Mr. Amateis.

The Commission inspected the models and thought them well made. Attention was called to the model of the American eagle, designed by Mr. Weinman and approved several months ago and to be used for one side of each of these medals.

Colonel H. A. Cooney, Chief of the Miscellaneous Branch, General Staff, War Department, was present to inspect the models. The secretary stated that he had talked with Captain Patrick, representing the Decorations Committee of the Navy Department, inviting him to be present at this meeting to see the models, but he was prevented from coming.

Colonel Cooney was well pleased with the models. The Chairman stated that this matter had been before the Commission fully a year and that heretofore the sculptors had submitted models showing symbolism, but none could be fully agreed upon by the War and Navy Departments and the Commission of Fine Arts. The idea of using a map for one side of the medal was therefore adopted.

Accordingly a report was sent to the Secretary of War approving the models. (Exhibit C)

Adlatio - Pacific Theater of Operations Medal, by Mr. Hartwig.

The Commission inspected the models and thought them well made.

Attention was called to the medal of the American Eagle, designed by Mr. Weinman and approved several months ago and to be used for one side of each of these medals.

Colonel E. A. Cooney, Chief of the Miscellaneous Branch, General Staff, War Department, was present to inspect the models. The secretary stated that he had talked with Captain Patrick, representing the Decorations Committee of the Navy Department, inviting him to be present at this meeting to see the models, but he was prevented from coming.

Colonel Cooney was well pleased with the models. The Chairman stated that this matter had been before the Commission fully a year and that before the sculptors had submitted models showing symbolism, but none could be fully agreed upon by the War and Navy Departments and the Commission of Fine Arts. The idea of using a map for one side of the medal was therefore adopted.

Accordingly a report was sent to the Secretary of War approving the models. (Exhibit C)

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
WASHINGTON

September 18, 1943.

My dear Mr. Secretary:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on September 17, 1943, approved models submitted by the following sculptors for three Theater of Operations Medals, as follows, and of which photographs are enclosed:

Obverse:

American Theater of Operations Medal, by Mr. Gaetano Cecere, sculptor, Saint Louis School of Fine Arts, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

European-African-Middle Eastern Theater of Operations Medal, by Mr. A. A. Weinman, sculptor, 234 Greenway South, Forest Hills, Long Island, New York.

Asiatic-Pacific Theater of Operations Medal, by Mr. Edmond R. Amateis, sculptor, Brewster, New York.

Reverse:

Model of an Eagle, by Mr. A. A. Weinman, sculptor, above mentioned, for the reverse of each of the three medals.

The completed models are at this Office and will be delivered to your representative.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Honorable Henry L. Stimson,
Secretary of War,
Washington, D. C.

GILMORE D. CLARKE
Chairman

EXHIBIT C

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
WASHINGTON

September 18, 1942.

My dear Mr. Secretary:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on

September 17, 1942, approved models submitted by the following

sculptors for three Theater of Operations Medals, as follows,

and of which photographs are enclosed:

Obverse:

American Theater of Operations Medal, by Mr. Gaetano Cecere,
sculptor, Saint Louis School of Fine Arts, Washington
University, St. Louis, Mo.

European-African-Middle Eastern Theater of Operations Medal,
by Mr. A. A. Weinman, sculptor, 254 Greenway South,
Forest Hills, Long Island, New York.

Asiatic-Pacific Theater of Operations Medal, by Mr. Edmond T.
Ametis, sculptor, Brewster, New York.

Reverse:

Model of an Eagle, by Mr. A. A. Weinman, sculptor, above
mentioned, for the reverse of each of the three medals.

The completed models are at this Office and will be delivered

to your representative.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Honorable Henry L. Stimson,
Secretary of War,
Washington, D. C.

[illegible] C. CLARKE
Chairman

EXHIBIT C

WAR DEPARTMENT

WASHINGTON, D. C.

NOVEMBER 25, 1943

Mr. Gilmore D. Clarke, Chairman,
The Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Clarke:

Reference is made to your memorandum of September 18, 1943, stating that the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on September 17, 1943 selected models submitted by competing sculptors, Mr. Gaetano Cecere, Mr. A. A. Weinman, and Mr. Edmond R. Amateis, for the three Theaters of Operations Medals.

The completed plaster models for the three Theaters of Operations Medals have been carefully examined by representatives of the War and Navy Departments and finally rejected as not meeting satisfactorily the requirements envisioned for such medals.

Developments during the war may include some outstanding event, combat action, or decisive victory over the enemy which it will be appropriate and desirable to commemorate and perpetuate in the service medal of each theater. Accordingly, instructions have been given to The Quartermaster General to suspend further action at this time in securing additional designs or plaster models for these medals.

Inclosed are copies of letters for your file which have been sent to the above sculptors informing them of the non-acceptance of the designs they submitted in competition for the three Theaters of Operations Medals.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON

Secretary of War.

Incls.
Copy of letters to:
Mr. Gaetano Cecere
Mr. A. A. Weinman
Mr. Edmond R. Amateis.

WAR DEPARTMENT

WASHINGTON, D. C.

November 23, 1943

Mr. A. A. Weinman,
234 Greenway South,
Forest Hills,
Long Island, New York.

Dear Mr. Weinman:

Representatives of the War and Navy Departments have examined the final plaster model submitted by you for the European-African-Middle Eastern Theater of Operations Medal and the model of an eagle for the reverse in response to the competition conducted by the Office of the Quartermaster General. Although the Commission of Fine Arts has commended your design for the European-African-Middle Eastern Theater of Operations Medal and the model of an eagle as the best of those submitted, the Departments are not entirely satisfied, and have jointly determined to take no further action at this time.

It is the desire of both the War and Navy Departments to have each medal commemorate, if possible, some outstanding event which may develop in each theater during the present war. As no appropriate event has so far taken place, both Departments have directed that all further competition in securing designs for the Theater Medals be suspended.

The War and Navy Departments wish to express their appreciation for the interest, thought, and effort which you have shown in the models you submitted, and hope you will find it possible to continue in the competition when it is reopened at some future date.

Sincerely yours,

M. G. WHITE,
Major General,
Assistant Chief of Staff.

COPY

November 23, 1943

Mr. Gaetano Cecere,
Saint Louis School of Fine Arts,
Washington University,
St. Louis, Mo.

Dear Mr. Cecere:

Representatives of the War and Navy Departments have examined the final plaster model submitted by you for the American Theater of Operations Medal in response to the competition conducted by the Office of the Quartermaster General. Although the Commission of Fine Arts has commended your design for the American Theater of Operations Medal as the best of those submitted, the Departments are not entirely satisfied, and have jointly determined to take no further action at this time.

It is the desire of both the War and Navy Departments to have each medal commemorate, if possible, some outstanding event which may develop in each theater during the present war. As no appropriate event has so far taken place, both Departments have directed that all further competition in securing designs for the Theater Medals be suspended.

The War and Navy Departments wish to express their appreciation for the interest, thought, and effort which you have shown in the models you submitted, and hope you will find it possible to continue in the competition when it is reopened at some future date.

Sincerely yours,

M. G. WHITE,
Major General,
Assistant Chief of Staff.

COPY

November 23, 1943

Mr. Edmond R. Amateis,
Brewster,
New York.

Dear Mr. Amateis:

Representatives of the War and Navy Departments have examined the final plaster model submitted by you for the Asiatic-Pacific Theater of Operations Medal in response to the competition conducted by the Office of the Quartermaster General. Although the Commission of Fine Arts has commended your design for the Asiatic-Pacific Theater of Operations Medal as the best of those submitted, the Departments are not entirely satisfied, and have jointly determined to take no further action at this time.

It is the desire of both the War and Navy Departments to have each medal commemorate, if possible, some outstanding event which may develop in each theater during the present war. As no appropriate event has so far taken place, both Departments have directed that all further competition in securing designs for the Theater Medals be suspended.

The War and Navy Departments wish to express their appreciation for the interest, thought, and effort which you have shown in the models you submitted, and hope you will find it possible to continue in the competition when it is reopened at some future date.

Sincerely yours,

M. G. WHITE,
Major General,
Assistant Chief of Staff.

COPY

COPY

Adolph Alexander Weinman
234 Greenway South
Forest Hills, Long Island, N. Y.

November 30, 1943.

Gilmore D. Clarke, Esq., Chairman,
Fine Arts Commission,
Interior Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Clarke:

I do not know whether you have been informed of the decision recently made by the War and Navy Departments relative to the Theater of Operation Medals, for which I have made three completed models. I shall not go into detail regarding that, as I am sure you are entirely familiar with the various steps of the work I have performed in connection with these medals.

I now am informed by the War Department General Staff that both Departments have changed their mind as to what these medals are to commemorate and I quote: "if possible some outstanding event in each theater during the present war. As no appropriate event has so far taken place, both Departments have directed that all further competition in securing designs for the Theater Medals be suspended". End of quote.

For your and the Fine Art Commission's information I enclose copy of my letter, which expresses my sentiments and point of view completely, though somewhat reservedly, in response to a letter received from Major General M. G. White, Assistant Chief of Staff. I am now awaiting his reply.

Please be assured of my sincere appreciation of the Commission's attitude during the carrying on of the competition and its earnest effort to secure a fitting design within the scope of the program.

Sincerely yours,

A. A. Weinman.

COPY

Adolph Alexander Weinman
234 Greenway South
Forest Hills, Long Island, N. Y.

November 27, 1943.

Major General M. G. White,
Assistant Chief of Staff,
War Department,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Major General:

This is to acknowledge your communication of November 23rd in reference to the three Theater of Operations Medals, for which I have submitted models in competition. I am putting it mildly when I say that I am surprised at the action now taken by the War and Navy Departments, after three of my models have been approved by officers of both departments in joint session with the Fine Arts Commission. The model of the standing Eagle was thus fully approved after I had been directed to make a change in the inscription. The model of the Flaming Sword was thus approved after I had made a slight modification of the sword and changed the inscription to conform to the Eagle side of the medal.

Then there was a change of opinion as to the desirability of the Flaming Sword and what seemed like a definite decision was reached between officers of both departments and the Fine Arts Commission to show on each of the three medals the map of one of the respective Theaters of Operation. I was instructed to prepare and submit to the Fine Arts Commission a model of the map of the European-African-Middle Eastern Theater. I first submitted a pencil drawing for this map and upon approval prepared a model, which also was approved.

Having thus gone far beyond the limits of what may reasonably be expected in a competition and having made three fully completed models, not sketches, I feel that I am entitled to the full compensation due me in accordance with the conditions set forth in the program to the competition. I am sure you will agree with me that the War and Navy Departments change of mind as to what these three medals were to symbolize or represent after the competition had been practically decided, should not react to the complete disadvantage and considerable financial loss of the competitors.

Sincerely yours,

(signed) A. A. Weinman.

COPY

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON

December 6, 1943.

Dear Mr. Weinman:

Thank you for your letter of the 30th of November, enclosing a copy of a communication addressed to General White; your remarks to this officer were in the circumstances most restrained, but nevertheless clear and to the point.

Mr. Caemmerer and I appeared before General White in Washington on November 19th, and, for your information, I attach a copy of the memorandum prepared immediately thereafter. You will note that I told the General that, in my opinion, the War Department had a moral obligation to pay the sculptors even though no contract was in force.

General White will no doubt refer the whole matter to the Judge Advocate General's office for an opinion. You can readily understand that, in the circumstances, he is powerless himself to recommend payment for your professional services. In matters of this character, so many are involved, and in this case both of the Armed Services, that it is impossible to place the responsibility upon anyone's shoulders.

I regret the incident, you may be assured; it certainly puts the Commission in an unfortunate position.

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman

Mr. A. A. Weinman
234 Greenway South
Forest Hills,
Long Island, New York

GDC:bdj

EDMOND AMATEIS

BREWSTER, NEW YORK

Nov. 29, 1943.

Mr. Gilmore D. Clarke,
10 Rockefeller Plaza,
New York City.

Dear Gil:

I am enclosing a copy of a letter that burps its own message in very definite terms. My first impulse was to tell the General what I thought of his understanding of legal and moral obligations but upon reflection and considerable use of the checkrein decided to come to papa first. The point is, how many times do we have to win a competition before it is finally ours? I don't know how the other sculptors feel about this but in my own case, having won the competition with one design, which was finally rejected by the Navy for fear of causing offense to the Japanese, creating four more designs more acceptable to the Navy and the Japanese and finally completing a map which seems to have been accepted by all except General White, I feel I have earned my pay.

If they intend to wait for some "outstanding event" that would mean the end of the war in all theaters. At that time they should hold another competition outlining definitely what they want. In the meanwhile they should liquidate their indebtedness for the first competition.

Yours very truly,

Edmond Amateis

Copy

The Commission of Fine Arts
Washington

November 30, 1943.

PERSONAL & CONFIDENTIAL

Edmond Amateis, Esq.
Brewster,
New York

Dear Ed:

I am in entire sympathy with the statement made in your letter. Unfortunately, however, you are not under contract to the Army and, legally, they are under no obligation. It hardly seems fair but that is the cold fact of the matter.

I personally appeared before General White and members of his staff and told them very definitely that they had a moral obligation to the sculptors. I am asking Mr. Caemmerer to send you a copy of the memorandum which was prepared after my conference with General White so that you can have a little better idea of what transpired. Unfortunately, I don't think that there is anything more that I can do in connection with this matter. The Secretary of War sent me a letter substantially the same as the one you received from General White, advising that they regret the fact that so much work had been done before the War and Navy Departments made up their minds that they wanted something entirely different.

This whole situation places The Commission of Fine Arts in an unfortunate position since we thought that we were acting for the War and Navy Departments, more particularly since we naturally assumed that the representative officers from the two departments who met with us were authorized to speak for their superiors. Apparently they were not. In fact, General White told me (as you will note from my memorandum which you will receive later) that he did not know what his subordinates were doing. Naturally, I regret the whole incident, more particularly because I do not see any way in which the sculptors can be compensated for their work.

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke

I am returning copy of General White's
letter since I already have a copy.

COPY

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Saint Louis

Saint Louis School
of Fine Arts.
Office of the Dean.

December 3, 1943.

Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary,
Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. Caemmerer:

Enclosed herewith is a copy of a letter sent to me by the War Department.

I strongly feel that the Commission of Fine Arts should protect the sculptor from callousness like this, since the Commission is composed of men who understand the amount of creative thought and tedious labor involved in the making of a model of a medal.

Considering the enormous amount of time and energy spent in executing models for this medal, I should not be asked to submit to another competition to design a new medal but be given the commission outright.

I feel that in justice I should either be paid for all my work or commissioned to do the future medal without submitting to future competitions.

Will you bring this letter to the attention of Mr. Clarke? I will await your reply.

Yours very truly,

Gaetano Cecere

Copy

The Commission of Fine Arts

Washington

December 11, 1943.

My dear Mr. Cecere:

With reference to your letter of December 3, Mr. Clarke has read it and he has asked me to send to you the enclosed copies of letters received from Mr. Weinman and from Mr. Amateis on the subject, together with copies of his replies thereto, which equally apply in your case. Also enclosed is copy of the Report to which Chairman Clarke refers.

I can assure you we are very sorry of the action taken by the War and Navy Departments in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

H. P. Caemmerer,

Secretary

Mr. Gaetano Cecere, Sculptor,
Saint Louis School of Fine Arts,
Washington University,
St. Louis, Mo.

COPY

EDMOND AMATEIS

Brewster, New York

December 11, 1943.

Mr. Gilmore D. Clarke,
10 Rockefeller Plaza,
New York City.

Dear Mr. Clarke:

Mr. Caemmerer has very kindly sent me all the letters and minutes of the various meetings pertaining to the medals, and while at the present time it is all rather distressing, it is quite plain from the records that General White is fully aware of our situation and not unsympathetic. Quite possibly an appeal can be made to the Judge Advocate General for payments due us or we could be assured that when the War Department is ready with a definite and final decision as to its desires we would be commissioned to execute the medals without further competition.

I know that you and your Commission are doing all you can to help us and I feel sure it will all be brought to a successful conclusion.

Cordially yours,

Edmond Amateis

COPY

EDMOND AMATEIS

Brewster, New York

December 11, 1943.

Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Sec.,
Commission of Fine Arts,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Caemmerer:

Thank you for sending me such a thorough report on all actions taken concerning the medals. I have just written to Mr. Clarke, the substance of my letter being that from the records of the meeting with General White it would appear that he is cognizant with our situation and not unsympathetic. If the Judge Advocate General gives a negative ruling then the War Department could assure us of the commission to execute these medals without further competition when it has decided what it wants. I have no doubt but that this matter can be successfully ironed out.

With best personal wishes, I am,

Yours very truly,

Edmond Amateis.

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

SAINT LOUIS

AINT LOUIS SCHOOL OF FINE ARTS

December 29th, 1943.

Mr. H. P. Caemmerer,
The Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. Caemmerer:

I have received all the copies and reports together with your letter of December 11th. I have also received the copy of your letter to Mr. Amateis in reply to his letter to Mr. Clarke, the latter was forwarded to me here in New York where I am spending the Holidays.

I am in agreement with Mr. Clarke's suggestion that the three sculptors take concerted action regarding the models executed for the Theater of Operations Medals. I have personally withheld taking further action pending the decision from the Judge Advocate General's office. I trust that Major General White has not delayed placing the whole matter before them.

Thank you for your Greetings which I reciprocate whole heartedly.

Sincerely yours,

Gaetano Cecere

ARC.

ADOLPH ALEXANDER WEINMAN

234 GREENWAY SOUTH

FOREST HILLS, LONG ISLAND, N. Y.

January 4, 1944.

Mr. Gilmore D. Clarke, Chairman,
The Commission of Fine Arts,
Interior Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Clarke:

Now that the glamour of the holiday season has vanished, I think it proper to take up the unfinished business of the Theater of Operation medals. I read with much interest the Commission's report, which you kindly sent me, in the matter of the competition and the further development of the designs for the three medals, as well as the copies of the letters by Messrs. Amateis and Cecere, voicing their reactions regarding the War and Navy Departments astonishing action to call the whole matter off after having, thru representative officers of both departments, made a definite selection of designs and announced, thru the Fine Arts Commission, the three winners in the competition.

While I fully recognize the prerogative of both the War and Navy Departments to change their plans whenever they see fit, they certainly should, and I am sure will, remunerate those who thru such change of plans have been put to considerable financial loss, unless reimbursed in accordance with the program of the competition, in conformity with which the three designs were produced and approved.

Having had no reply to my letter of November 27th last to Major General White of the General Staff in regard to this matter, I write to inquire whether you can direct me to the proper department to which I can present my demand for payment due me and fully earned.

I may also state that if the matter of these medals is thrown into another competition, I certainly shall not be among those competing. Please be assure that I regret having to bother you so much about this very unpleasant matter.

Sincerely yours,

A. A. Weinman

January 8, 1944.

My dear Mr. Weinman:

This will acknowledge your letter of January 4th, concerning the Theater of Operations Medal.

It is a most aggravating affair and I deeply sympathize with you and the other sculptors in this matter. Since you have not heard from Major General White in reply to your letter, I am writing to him about it, and enclose a copy of my letter. I shall advise you promptly as soon as I hear from him. A little time will have to be allowed for this as the General will doubtless confer with the Judge Advocate General's office before replying.

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Mr. A. A. Weinman
234 Greenway South
Forest Hills, Long Island
New York

Enc.

COPY

The Commission of Fine Arts

Washington

January 8, 1944.

My dear General White:

Since the conference at your office on November 19, 1943, concerning the models for the Theater of Operations Medals, I have received letters from the sculptors, Messrs. Weinman, Cecere, and Amateis, concerning the action taken by the War Department in relation to this matter. As I related to you at your office, these gentlemen devoted a year or more to the work of preparing models in an effort to satisfy representatives of the War and Navy Departments.

It now develops that this work was done at a considerable financial loss to the sculptors and each one of them claims that he is entitled to the payment of the $1500 as stipulated in the competitive program.

It was my impression that you stated to me that if any question developed concerning payment to the sculptors you would be willing to refer the matter to the Judge Advocate General for a ruling. Unless this has been done, I would appreciate it very much if you would take such action. The sculptors have been "hard hit" by the War, and these three gentlemen, in particular, should not be asked to take a loss by reason of the fact that the original program, under which they worked, has been changed. I would personally appreciate it if you would give this matter your attention.

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke
Chairman.

Major General M. G. White
Assistant Chief of Staff, G-1
War Department
Washington, D. C.

February 18, 1944.

Dear Mr. Goodman:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting today, considered your letter of February 16th, together with designs you submitted for "Have-A-Hoffie" Shops for erection in this city.

The Commission have no objection to the erection of these structures, provided a white porcelain enamel is used and the roof sign on the building is removed; provided further that the advertising signs on the building do not exceed a total of 25 square feet and that no red neon or flashing signs be used.

With regard to the locations, the Commission would prefer that the building not face Pennsylvania Avenue, but rather be set back from the Avenue facing Sixth Street. The Commission would not object to the erection of the structure at the northwest corner of Connecticut Avenue and H Street, Northwest.

It is understood, of course, that a formal submission of designs would be made to the Inspector of Buildings of the District of Columbia.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Respectfully yours,

Mr. M. Harold Goodman,
632 Investment Building,
Washington, D. C.

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Exhibit C

January 21, 1944.

Dear Mr. Wyeth:

The revised design for the Patterson School building, which you submitted with your letter of January 12th, has received the attention of the architect members of the Commission of Fine Arts, and upon their recommendation the Commission approve the design. I respectfully call your attention to the attached copies of letters, and trust that you will give consideration to the incorporation of the suggestions made by Messrs. Cret and Lamb.

Enclosed you will find the set of blue prints sent to Dr. Cret, incorporating his suggestions.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman

Mr. Nathan C. Wyeth
Municipal Architect
District Building
Washington, D. C.

Exhibit D

February 23, 1944.

Dear Mr. Lynn:

The Commission of Fine Arts has for sometime felt the need of a War Art Museum in Washington which should be organized and operated under the auspices of the United States Government and should contain a selection of paintings and sculpture depicting events and persons connected with the various wars in which this country has been engaged.

During the present war there have been held at the National Gallery of Art and other museums in this country exhibitions such as the one of "The Army at War", now on view at the National Gallery, and the exhibition recently held there of "Naval Aviation". Included in these exhibitions were paintings by some of our most distinguished American artists, presenting a record of the present war which from both an artistic and historic point of view should be preserved for future generations.

In addition, the Director of the National Gallery, Mr. Finley, who is also a member of the Commission of Fine Arts, has advised the Commission that the National Gallery has made a survey of available paintings depicting events and persons connected with other wars in which this country has been engaged; and he has stated that, in his opinion, an interesting and valuable collection of such works of art could be formed for permanent exhibition in a museum in Washington.

The Commission is impressed with the importance of establishing such a museum and hopes that a suitable building can be provided for this purpose. We understand that the building at Fifth and E Streets, which houses the United States Supreme Court for the District of Columbia, is not adequate for the needs of the Court and that plans are being made for a larger building on Judiciary Square which may make it possible to use the present building for other purposes. This building, by reason of its location as well as its historic associations and architectural merit would be eminently suited, in the opinion of the Commission, for use as a museum of the sort proposed.

The Commission, at a meeting held on February 18th, agreed to recommend the use of this building for such a purpose, if and when it shall be available and authority can be secured. The Commission also suggested that the organization of this Museum be entrusted to the National Gallery of Art and that the administration of it be placed under the Gallery, provided an arrangement can be made which would be satisfactory to the trustees of that institution. The Commission has asked that I communicate their views to you and express the hope that these views would meet with your approval and that you would be willing to cooperate in securing the necessary legislation to carry into effect this plan for a War Art Museum in Washington.

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Honorable David Lynn,
The Architect of the Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

DEF/b

Exhibit E

March 1, 1944.

My dear Mr. Chief Justice:

Last October you addressed a letter to me indicating that the portraits in the Supreme Court and in other governmental buildings require restoration and care by a competent expert. I immediately referred your letter to the Honorable David E. Finley, a member of this Commission and the Director of the National Gallery of Art.

I have just had a report from Mr. Finley stating that he took up the matter with you and with the Architect of the Capitol and, further, that you have written a letter to Senator Barkley, Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Library, suggesting the appointment of a competent person to take care of portraits in the Supreme Court Building, the Capitol, the War and Navy Departments, and in other government buildings in the National Capital, excepting only museums where arrangements for the care of works of art are already in force.

The Commission of Fine Arts are very glad indeed that a program designed to protect these important portraits and other paintings has been worked out to your satisfaction, and we hope that the Congress will endorse your recommendation by the enactment of appropriate legislation.

If the Commission can be of any further assistance in this matter, I hope that you will call upon us.

Cordially and sincerely yours,

FOR THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Gilmore D. Clarke
Chairman

The Chief Justice
of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

Exhibit F

COPY

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY
PUBLIC ROADS ADMINISTRATION
25

January 12, 1944.

Major General Ulysses S. Grant, III,
Chairman, National Capital Park and
Planning Commission,
Washington, D. C.

My dear General Grant:

A number of conferences have been held among the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, the Fine Arts Commission, District of Columbia officials and Public Roads Administration personnel for the purpose of reaching general agreement as to the basic location and design of a new crossing of the Potomac River to replace ultimately the present Highway Bridge. At a meeting on November 19, 1943, attended by myelf, the idea of designing a single structure to carry 8 lanes was discarded, and your Commission asked for comparative studies of two solutions. A discussion of these solutions, one a single two-way structure located upstream from the existing bridge and the other two one-way structures, one on the line of the existing bridge and the other parallel thereto about 500 feet downstream, was presented by Mr. Olmstead and Mr. Nolen at a meeting on December 16, 1943. Our District Engineer reported that the studies made by our organization disclosed the need for 8 lanes of travel and Mr. Olmstead disclosed the need for approximately 3-1/2lanes in each direction. In answer to your request, Mr. Swain advised that we would submit for your consideration a further traffic analysis. It was understood that this analysis would cover the general situation but that it particularly would be concerned with showing the relationship between the approaches on both sides of the river and the capacity of the river crossing. It is presumed from your request that, despite the resolution passed at that meeting, you have an open mind regarding the relative merits of the two schemes.

We have referred the plans to several men of extensive experience in urban problems, in the design and construction of modern highways, parkways and bridges and in the aesthetics of city development, all of whom expressed definite opinions that the two-bridge plan is superior to the single bridge plan. I am in full agreement with these opinions and submit, in addition to the results of the traffic analysis you requested, reasons for arriving at such conclusion which may not have been presented heretofore.

Exhibit G

The analysis of probable traffic leads to the conclusion that the facility should be designed for a peak load of 5,000 vehicles per hour in each direction for a period of time in excess of an hour and that about 18 percent of the vehicles should be assumed to be trucks. This conclusion is drawn from numerous factors, the salient ones being as follows:

1941 average daily traffic was 44,500 vehicles, of which 15 percent were trucks.

1943 average daily traffic would be 53,500 vehicles if traffic had been allowed to develop normally.

1960 average daily traffic is estimated to be 89,000 vehicles (not allowing for any deflection of peak hour traffic from Memorial Bridge. Practical peak hour capacity of Memorial Bridge was reached in 1941).

A normal distribution of the expected average daily traffic for 1960 would result in numerous one-way peak loads well in excess of 5,000 vehicles per hour but the observed distribution at Highway Bridge is such that it would be safe to design for that figure. There have been isolated and exceptional instances where 5,000 vehicles per hour have been accommodated on three traffic lanes but in these cases few trucks were included, movement was slow and the approaches were entirely free of hindrance due to turning vehicles. During such periods of peak traffic any disruption of the smooth flow, such as vehicles slowing down to make loop turns or a vehicle stopped for any reason not only backs up traffic but has been known to stop traffic completely. If a facility at 14th Street is constructed for only three lanes in each direction and the left turning traffic, constituting in excess of one-fourth of the total, is required to negotiate the inner loop of a cloverleaf, it is probable that future traffic will meet congestion, a very compelling reason for constructing at this location a design of complete adequacy and attractiveness to traffic. Any inadequacy here definitely will tend to force a commercial use of Memorial Bridge. As you so aptly stated in a recent talk, traffic floods cannot be confined within inadequate banks. There is grave danger that an inadequacy at 14th Street would flood Memorial Bridge. This bridge, Memorial Bridge, was built to connect National Shrines on the two sides of the Potomac River. On the Virginia side lie the Lee Mansion and the Arlington Cemetery. The latter seemingly must undergo extreme expansion and within its expanded environs will repose plots of ground and markers sacred to a larger number of our citizens than could have been expected two decades ago. On the District of Columbia side of the bridge lie the Lincoln Memorial, the Washington Monument and the National Capitol. The value of maintaining a quiet dignity and serenity to the travel way within and to the travel

approaches to these shrines is difficult to overemphasize. The preservation of an appropriate environment for these shrines can be aided by providing an attractive alternate way for those who in the course of their daily work must go from beyond the limits of this area on the west to beyond the limits of the area on the east.

Our traffic analysis find no justification for the building at 14th Street of a facility of doubtful capacity with the hope that such action will compel the building of a bridge at Alexandria. Observations show that whenever in like situations additional facilities are forced by the impact of traffic the original facility needs all that initially was contemplated. Thus it is my considered judgment that it would be unwise to construct a facility of inadequate capacity with the hope that such an act would cause the building of an additional facility at another location and that the two combined would solve the problem.

The approaches at both ends of the bridge would be in balance with four lanes for each direction across the river and out of balance with three lanes. The Pentagon Network at Highway Bridge is designed for three full lanes in each direction. Where vehicles must slow down for interchange added width is provided even at structures. The Mount Vernon Memorial Highway is an excellent traffic facility protected for all time from promiscuous encroachment. With directional interchange the more than 25 percent of traffic which turns between it and Highway Bridge can be efficiently accommodated so that the south approach may conservatively be considered to be equivalent to more than four lanes. On the north approach the Main Avenue grade separation can accommodate three lanes in each direction and the streets to the north can, or can be made to, distribute this volume easily. Between the bridgehead and the Maine Avenue grade separation considerable traffic will be diverted to 15th Street, 17th Street, and East Potomac Park; just how much is uncertain but the north approach can handle much more than three lanes. Whether the fourth lane across the river is used as a full fourth traffic lane or as a speed-change and maneuvering lane is immaterial. The full capacity of a facility four lanes in each direction can be handled readily on both approaches.

Two factors which also effect the choice of location are the possibility of excellent architectural treatment of the facility and surrounding area and the extent to which existing structures are used or destroyed. With regard to the former we have the unanimous opinion of the Commission of Fine Arts that the 2-bridge scheme is preferable. With regard to the latter, the 2-bridge plan utilizes all existing structures on both approaches whereas the single bridge plan contemplates the destruction of the stone-faced bridge carrying U. S. 1 over the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway, the refilling of a corner of

the Pentagon lagoon and the construction of a new bridge under the railroad on the District shore while abandoning the existing bridge nearby. The destruction of existing facilities sometimes is justified but I could not approve a plan involving the destruction of adequate and costly facilities in the face of a superior plan which utilizes practically all existing facilities.

The correctness of the statement attributed to the Commission in connection with a news release after the meeting on December 16 is recognized fully, namely, that your Commission acts in an advisory and not an action capacity. It is recognized that the District of Columbia and the Public Roads Administration could proceed to design a facility on any basis they might select. It also is realized that your Commission carries sufficient weight to aid or delay the accomplishment of a civic improvement.

The 2-bridge solution of the problem under discussion is in my considered judgment so outstandingly superior to any of the other solutions examined that I am confident that if your Commission will give consideration to the data herewith and heretofore presented your findings will coincide with those of the other groups who have analyzed all of the elements of the problem. The weight of evidence and competent opinion are so overwhelmingly on the side of the plan showing two one-way bridges that I would find it most difficult, if not impossible, to approve the single bridge plan if submitted for Federal participation in its design or construction.

Very truly yours,

(signed) THOS. H. MACDONALD,

Commissioner of Public Roads.

JB-CES-mlw

Extract of Minutes of Meeting of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Washington, D. C., November 18-19, 1944.

24. Proposed Highway Bridge

MAJOR GILMORE D. CLARKE, Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, MR. THOMAS MACDONALD, Commissioner, Public Roads Administration and MR. JOSEPH BARNETT, Highway Engineer of that office; and Capt. H. C. WHITEHURST, Director of Highways, D. C. Government, were present for this discussion.

MR. FREDERICK LAW OLMSTED, engaged as consultant by the National Park Service, submitted a report on this subject, attached as Appendix B.

In this report he summarized his opinion as follows:

"Out of all the various possible solutions thus far studied the scheme represented by Study J, submitted by Mr. Whitehurst at the October 21 meeting of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and the generally similar Studies C and K, appears in principle to offer decidedly the best balance of advantages over disadvantages, all things considered. The main reasons for this conclusion are given below.

"There appears to be general agreement that of all the other schemes that have been studied those for which the strongest arguments can be made are represented in principle by Study B (the two-bridge scheme) and Study G with its possible future variant (single bridge scheme on a location downstream from the present bridge and substantially parallel thereto). I therefore confine my discussion to those three schemes."

After reading the report MR. OLMSTED discussed various phases and details of the project.

MAJOR CLARKE made this statement: "The Commission of Fine Arts is not concerned with respect to the volume of traffic because that is outside of our province and we must rely on the best advice we can get in such matters. We discussed the matter of traffic flow with representatives of the Public Roads Administration and Capt. WHITEHURST and the general conclusion among those experts is that it would be unwise, and extremely so, to build a crossing of the Potomac at this point having less than 8 moving lanes for traffic. That is necessary because the Commission has already made commitments for approach roads to this bridge which might demand eight lanes across the bridge. Those who have studied the problem are of the opinion that it would be wise to provide an additional lane for each direction of traffic, which would take care of traffic entering the bridge on the highway or on the

other access roads close to the abutments of the bridge, so as not to delay the three lanes moving on the bridge. The volume of traffic is already there. No one knows what the postwar period will bring in connection with motor vehicles. I think in building this structure, which will have a life of at least 100 years, I would think it would be extremely unwise to design a bridge where any question about its adequacy exists. If you plan for an eight lane bridge you should be committed to two structures. In considering the aesthetics of the problem there can be almost as many opinions as there are people. It would be better not to have the railroad bridge in there and I am wondering if in connection with the future of this bridge, that railroad bridge will be replaced with a tunnel for railroad traffic across the river, within the life time of this new bridge. That is worth considering. We previously raised the question of dignity of a crossing which might be as wide as 130 ft. which would carry both trucks and commercial and pleasure traffic and would provide eight lanes of traffic. My own judgment is that it would be exceedingly unpleasant for the four lanes moving in opposite directions approaching the great Capitol. Then there is the relationship of the bridge to the Jefferson Memorial. When you consider placing that bridge on the axis of the Memorial, you must realize that the only persons seeing it would be those on the front seat of the car. I do not think we pay as much attention to that problem as MR. OLMSTED has brought up. My own thought is for two separate bridges, and the view out the side window of the car going north would be far better than it would be on the axis of the bridge. Certainly four lanes of traffic five hundred feet from the other bridge would make a much better situation. Also, you have the problems on and off the bridge. Fully 28 percent of the present traffic in the southern direction turns left on to the Memorial Highway and that may increase. Our experience in New York indicates that if you build a good road without traffic lights or grade crossings, it invites traffic. I think that making cars coming south go right and turn left on the highway is undesirable, particularly when those cars must filter in from the inside to the outside lanes, to the right lane which is lined with trucks. I understand that 24 percent of the traffic previously was truck traffic. It would not be desirable to filter into that truck traffic by turning right. I think it is important, and the Commission of Fine Arts felt so, to keep Arlington Memorial Bridge as a memorial bridge as far as possible. Enlargement of the Cemetery will make it a great National shrine for America and we would like to feel that the new bridge would be thoroughly adequate to discourage those going to Maryland and Virginia from crossing the Memorial Bridge unless going for a pleasure drive or a trip to the cemetery. In closing my remarks, may I say that if we assume that we must have eight lanes for traffic, which I personally prefer, then I think we are forced to a two-bridge scheme. I do not know of any bridge which would approach the width

of this proposed bridge with eight lanes and two sidewalks. I think it would create a bad situation and a must undignified approach to the National Capital."

CAPTAIN WHITEHURST stated: "The scheme that MR. OLMSTED refers to has been before the District. The Commissioners arrived at their conclusion after discussion of the plans now under consideration. Scheme G for a single bridge involves scrapping work previously undertaken on the Virginia and District sides. The Engineer Commissioner asked me to prepare a sketch that would obviate that feature, so we get back to one single bridge close to the present bridge, and that is the reason that a single bridge is submitted at that location. As to the number of lanes to be provided, we have sought advice because we do not want to make a mistake in providing too little volume because it will be here many years. I am depending upon the advice of others as to the width, but if it is to be an eight lane bridge, I agree that it should be in two bridges and not one. The later scheme was an endeavor to prevent scrapping what has already been done. The Commissioners have not taken definite action in the matter because they want the advice of others. They feel that so far as capacity is concerned, the gentlemen from Public Roads have had much more experience than we have. Many of the advantages in the double bridge plan would be absent in the single bridge."

The Commission recessed for lunch from 12:15 to 1 p.m. and reconvened.

25. Proposed Highway Bridge (See also Par. 24)

Discussion of bridge plans continued. MR. MACDONALD, Commissioner of Public Roads made this statement - "It is a very difficult problem. We have for a number of years been dealing largely in highway work with rural problems to such an extent that we feel now that while our highways in the country outside the metropolitan areas are definitely inferior to the type desired and lacking in mileage, we are definitely now in the period of giving attention to the urban problems. We have been making studies of the flow of traffic within metropolitan areas, which are defined about the same way as the Census Bureau does. They define it according to the influence that the metropolitan area has on the rural district. That distance ranges from about 6 miles up to 30 to 35 miles so that we are now considering and will have ready very soon, a report termed "A System of National Inter-Regional Highways", which largely covers the urban problems. In connection with that it is necessary to make detailed studies of the traffic flow within and approaching the metropolitan areas and one of the most conclusive proofs we can find is that the city itself is the origin and destination of the very large amount of traffic that approaches the city. The whole theory that by-pass routes will solve traffic problems has been very definitely exploded. We find that with any city, the amount of traffic by-passing it is a small percentage of the total traffic so the

problem comes down to handling that traffic within the city in such a way as to do the least harm to the city. We are sensitive to the impact and the solution of any traffic problem, especially to that existing in the Washington area. Regardless of the disposition of people, we find that they are determined to go to certain places.

"We arrive at the solution of the two-bridge plan for this particular problem on the basis of splitting the differential between the possible impact upon the landscape values on the one hand and the necessity of taking care of traffic, plus certain practical considerations. We definitely would not be willing to participate in an eight lane single bridge because I feel personally that after all; an eight lane thoroughfare is a pretty big sort of thing to introduce any place. You get a great many rural visitors to this city, and I am definitely not in favor of participating in this kind of project, from the cost standpoint and from the Federal standpoint, in an eight lane structure. It may be questioned whether we need an eight lane structure. We had in 1942 fifty-four thousand vehicles. If conditions return to normal, and with the difficulty of not knowing what will be the occupancy of the Pentagon Building later, there is no reason to believe that nothing would be changed. The Commission has approved in essence, the Shirley Memorial Highway which will result in bringing traffic directly to the bridges. The Pentagon Building traffic can be distributed. That being an express highway and having sufficient capacity, will distribute traffic to the three bridges, and then I think you should try and "lure" traffic to this bridge and keep it away from the Georgetown and Memorial Bridges. The Memorial Bridge is the very center of a development that is the most important in the United States. The Commission is also about to approve a new route coming in as a parkway from the north. I am thinking of this in the larger terms and thinking about the development of the Memorial Parkway and the Shirley Highway, all having the 'makings' of a through traffic route, so that traffic would be made to go along the fringe or border line of the city.

"Going back to the eight lane bridge, it might be argued that a six lane bridge is necessary and no more. The flow of traffic in 1942 passed the peak capacity of a six lane bridge at the peak hour of use. There is no way we have been able to find in which to develop the clover-leaf design to take care of more than a single line of traffic. The best we have been able to see from the traffic angle is that there should be four lanes in either direction, one lane serving as an accelerating and decelerating lane; 3 lanes for through traffic. We believe that four lanes should be in separate structures and believe that because the other developments in this area are bound to add to the traffic, there should be definite provision not only to provide for traffic there now, but to take traffic away from the Lincoln Memorial and Georgetown bridges. This plea is based on taking care of traffic in a more expeditious way than forcing traffic to the other bridges.

In that way we may be able to keep the traffic that will result after the war from going through the upper area. It seems to me that anything you can do to get this main line traffic away from the fringe of the cemetery is a movement in the proper direction, and if you accept that, the practical consideration of these other points induces us to recommend the two bridge type plan. I hope in making that recommendation we are not losing so many things as MR. OLMSTED brought out. We are trying to think of removing some of the impact from the Lincoln Memorial Bridge. We must take care of a very large volume of traffic and I think it is desirable to provide for as much traffic as possible. The clover-leaf arrangement has definite limitations on the number of vehicles it can handle. From the practical point of view we are attempting to direct the attention of Congress to the desirability of providing for the urban problem as a postwar program. We hope to direct their attention to the urban instead of the rural road problem. If this is going to go forward, we may be undertaking such a problem as this before the end of the war."

MAJOR CLARKE added - "I would like to raise the question of the cost to the Government, of the existing improvements should those be destroyed in favor of building any of these schemes. I think in our postwar economy you will have to be very careful, with respect to the destruction of improvements already made, and although it is not for the Fine Arts Commission to go into, I would issue a word of warning that it would be unwise certainly to destroy two grade structures, one built recently, in order to accomplish any scheme. My understanding is that the destruction of those two bridges, plus other improvements which would be destroyed, would bring the total up about three-quarters of a million dollars more, based on estimates. That seems to me a very important factor even though this may be 15 or 20 percent of the total expenditure of funds necessary to construct the new crossing."

These phases of the matter and questions were discussed - that under the dual bridge plan, four full lanes can be provided in each direction; that the location of the single bridge is determined by the clearance required for the draw of the existing bridge, which must be operated during the construction period; impression of MR. MACDONALD that the Commission's action is limited by the improvements already made at each approach to the bridge; that restudy should be undertaken of a six-lane bridge in this general location which would not interfere with the drawspan of the existing bridge; that the proposed Alexandria Bridge should be given important consideration in connection with the plans now under consideration; that the Alexandria Bridge could be made to carry a large volume of traffic bound around the city, passing along South Capitol Street and into the Anacostia and Baltimore-Washington Parkways; that this proposed Alexandria Bridge should offset any increase in traffic over the proposed Highway

bridge; that some type of temporary construction might be devised to permit operation of the existing drawspan during construction of the new bridge; that apparently only two solutions have presented themselves - one for a six-lane bridge far enough removed from the draw span to permit its uninterrupted use, and the other the dual bridge plan; that at least four traffic lanes must be available for traffic use before the existing structure can be removed.

MOTION unanimously carried by the Commission members that further study be given to a single six-lane bridge, this study to determine the distance the proposed bridge must be located to permit operation, during construction, of the drawspan in the present bridge; the effect a single six-lane bridge will have on the Virginia side of the river and the construction now there; and further study be made also of the dual-bridge plan, including a determination of the advantages and/or disadvantages of each plan. This study is to take into consideration the questions brought out in MR. OLMSTED'S report concerning the Jefferson Memorial.

December 8, 1943

Dear General Grant:

At the last meeting of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, you afforded me the privilege of expressing the views of the Commission of Fine Arts, as well as my own opinions, concerning the relative merits of the two schemes proposed for the Potomac River Crossing at 14th Street; I am appreciative of the courtesy extended to the Commission and to me to participate in these discussions.

It appears that the Planning Commission still favors a single bridge providing for six lanes of traffic. While the Commission of Fine Arts would not raise objections to a single six-lane bridge, I feel that those best qualified to judge future traffic volumes in this area are confident that an eight-lane crossing is both desirable and necessary. I personally share that view. In my considered judgment, it would be unwise and shortsighted to authorize the construction of a crossing or crossings providing for less than eight lanes of traffic, for reasons already emphasized by engineers who have testified before the Planning Commission.

In my opinion, altogether too much stress has been placed upon the importance of a by-pass route which it is presumed may relieve the central part of the Capital of much through traffic. That is only a hope which is not bourne out by experience with traffic flow in other large cities; Washington is no exception to the sound observations which point clearly to the fact that by-pass routes around large centers of population frequently do not invite enough traffic to justify constructing them. It is clear to those who have studied these problems that even with a by-pass, a major part of the traffic will continue to flow through the city to the full capacity of the roads leading to it. In the case of Washington, since there are at least two important potentially six-lane highways (Lee Boulevard and U. S. Route #1) approaching the Capitol on the Virginia side; there is not the slightest doubt, in the minds of those competent to judge, that the Potomac Crossing should consist of eight traffic lanes in order to be adequate.

As suggested at the last meeting of the Planning Commission, by prior favorable action on what has already been done respecting road widths on the Virginia side of the River, the Planning Commission now appears to be committed to eight lanes in order to provide a sufficiently spacious and adequate crossing of the Potomac at Fourteenth Street.

Mr. Demaray sent me a copy of Mr. Olmsted's remarks of November 19th. Nothing Mr. Olmsted said changes the opinion of the Commission of Fine Arts with respect to this problem. The trees referred to are transitory only and should not be deemed invaluable factors in connection with an improvement as important and as long-lived as a bridge. New trees of suitable size and variety should be planted in appropriate locations and in proper relationship to the new composition which will be created as a result of adding a vital major improvement to this section of the Capital.

I do not subscribe to the remarks concerning the "very regrettable impression" that would be created by having three bridges rather than two across this section of the Potomac River. That statement is, very naturally, debatable since it is based upon aesthetics and in that area of thought there may be as many answers as there are persons to debate it.

I do not have the time, nor am I inclined to discuss Mr. Olmsted's lengthy memorandum in every detail; however, there is one point that I wish to emphasize, which has to do with the "relationship" of the crossing and the approaches to the Jefferson Memorial. I cannot too strongly emphasize the importance of avoiding an axial relationship between one of the bridges, or of the bridge, and the Memorial. To attempt to relate these structures by the use of a formal straight axis would be, in my judgment, a fatal error. The Memorial was not designed to be approached on axis from the side and it is my feeling that it may be viewed best from the bridges and approaches if seen off axis through trees, more or less casually. There is great danger in overdoing axial relationships in Washington.

In closing, I shall quote from, and then comment briefly upon a portion of, Mr. Olmsted's report (page 5). He states that "Mr. Nolen. . . inclines strongly to the opinion that traffic conditions on those portions of the street system of Washington, through which traffic will flow. . . will limit the actual flow of traffic to and from the bridge or bridges to less than the maximum effective capacity of eight lanes of free moving bridge traffic; and that for reasons of economics, etc." Is it sound economics to advocate a six-lane bridge at Fourteenth Street, which is predicated upon another bridge and another highway

(through Alexandria and Maryland) to serve as a by-pass? The engineers of the Public Roads Administration tell us that, based upon past experience, the by-pass will probably not attract a large volume of through traffic. It seems to me that Mr. Olmsted's conclusions are predicated very largely upon Mr. Nolen's judgment in traffic matters; I prefer to base my judgment upon the training and experience of those who deal almost exclusively with problems of this sort.

These remarks are set forth more forcefully than is my custom; however, I feel confident that if less than an eight-lane crossing, which requires two bridges, is planned to cross the Potomac at Fourteenth Street the Planning Commission and others responsible for the decision will be severely criticized for having been short-sighted and for having neglected to take the advice of those who are most competent to pass judgment upon this problem.

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke, Chairman

Major General U. S. Grant III
Chairman, National Capital Park and Planning Comm.
Washington, D. C.

GDC:bdj

October 25, 1943

Captain H. C. Whitehurst
Director of Highways
Government of the District of Columbia
Washington, D. C.

Dear Captain Whitehurst:

I wish to thank you for your letter of October 11 which I failed to acknowledge, first, because I was awaiting the results of your meeting with Commissioner MacDonald, and second, because I hoped to be able to convince Mr. William A. Delano, whom I met last week, that the two-bridge scheme crossing the Potomac at 14th Street was better than the proposal of the Planning Commission to construct a single bridge.

My talk with Mr. Delano may have caused him to waiver somewhat with respect to the single bridge scheme, but nevertheless he was evidently unable to convince his colleagues on the Commission that they should depart from their adherence to the one-bridge idea. I gained this information from Mr. Hubbard, who spent the day with me Saturday on Long Island. He told me that the majority of the members of the Planning Commission were more in favor of one bridge. He further related that there is to be another meeting, at which Mr. MacDonald and others will be present.

This morning I received a copy of your letter to Mr. MacDonald dated October 23, and I can assure you that I shall be very happy indeed to be present in Washington on November 18 or 19 for the purpose of meeting with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission as a representative of the Commission of Fine Arts.

This morning I had occasion to talk on the telephone with Mr. Joseph Barnett, and I took the opportunity to discuss with him the problem related to the Potomac crossing. Yesterday, while thinking over this matter, an idea occurred to me which I gave to Mr. Barnett and which I present as a possibility which might overcome some of the disadvantages of the two-bridge scheme.

My suggestion is that in adopting the two-bridge scheme, the structure next to the railroad crossing be designated for commercial and business traffic, and that the other structure to the north and upstream be designated for passenger vehicles. By adopting such a scheme, the disadvantage of having trucks pass close to the Jefferson Memorial would be eliminated and there would be an added advantage of connecting the system of park drives on the Washington side of the river with the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway on the Virginia side via a parkway bridge, thus tying together the system of park drives so that passenger cars need not travel over any portion of road or bridge mixed with trucks and commercial vehicles.

I fully appreciate that the adoption of such a scheme will require two-lane approaches at each end of the project so that two lanes of trucks going in one direction may pass over or under two lanes of passenger vehicles at points where the traffic becomes mixed. However, the cost of these two structures will not be large, particularly inasmuch as it would be possible to save the two existing structures on the Virginia side of the river, namely, the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway overpass and the overpass on the War Department network, which reconstruction I understand from Mr. Barnett would cost in the neighborhood of three-quarters of a million dollars.

I have no idea whether such a scheme as I have suggested will work, but I pass it along for what it may be worth, believing that it may have merit and may result in eliminating some of the criticisms which members of the Planning Commission raise in connection with a dual crossing.

If your office and the office of Public Roads come to the conclusion that eight lanes of traffic are required on the Potomac crossing, then I think two bridges are necessary. On the other hand, if you decide that six lanes of traffic are sufficient, then the question of whether there should be one or two bridges is, in my judg-

ment, more debatable. I have no way of coming to a conclusion in my own mind concerning the merit of six versus eight lanes, and I know that the Commission of Fine Arts accept your judgment in this matter. However, it does seem to me that it would be folly to build a bridge where there is any doubt about its adequacy, because it is almost impossible to widen it in the years to come.

I assume that at the next meeting of the Planning Commission one day will be designated for the discussion of this bridge matter. I plan to hold a meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts the same day because we have other matters to come up. Therefore, I shall ask Mr. Caemmerer to take up with Mr. Nolen the exact time of the session in which this matter is to be discussed.

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke
Chairman

CC:
Mr. Joseph Barnett
Mr. Caemmerer
Mr. Clarke

COPY

September 20, 1943.

Captain H. C. Whitehurst
Director of Highways
Engineering Department
Government of the District of Columbia
Washington, D. C.

Dear Captain Whitehurst:

RE: PROPOSED NEW CROSSING OF THE POTOMAC RIVER AT 14TH STREET

The project involving the reconstruction of the old 14th Street Bridge across the Potomac River is a most important one, one in which The Commission of Fine Arts is vitally interested. While this interest is very largely based upon factors which relate to purely aesthetic considerations we are, nevertheless, conscious of the fact that the purely practical problems will control the general appearance of the structure. Thus, if we take a broad view of this situation we shall find that the aesthetic factors include all matters affecting three out of the five senses, sight, hearing and smell, as well as the factors of convenience, appropriateness and economy. I mention this because I am sure that the Commission of Fine Arts is thoroughly competent to consider every factor of this problem which has to do with the effect of the design upon the public, including the appearance of the structure (or structures) which it is your purpose to have designed. In fact, it is the Commission's duty to consider and to report upon all questions which in any manner affect the public use as that use relates to the outward appearance of the National Capital.

At the joint meeting last Friday I voiced the opinion of the Commission with respect to the merits of twin spans with a single span, adding that we unanimously approve of twin spans for this crossing.

It is not my intention to set forth those reasons, which have already been stated clearly by Mr. Joseph Barnett in his memorandum to Mr. C. E. Swain, and by you and by Mr. Barnett before the two official bodies in joint session. The Commission of Fine Arts have already voiced their full confidence in you and in Mr. Barnett, realizing the vast accumulation of experience you have each enjoyed in the field of engineering related particularly to the handling of traffic problems. The Commission of Fine Arts accept your recommendations to construct two bridges rather than one and, to reinforce what already has been written and stated, I shall add a few more pertinent reasons which may or may not have been recorded. Mr. Barnett has aptly stated that "the principal advantage of constructing two one-way bridges an appreciable distance apart is that they best fit the requirements of traffic." Modern highway design should aim to make driving as safe and as pleasant as possible, certainly that axiom cannot be denied. Therefore, it seems to the Commission of Fine Arts that a much safer scheme of traffic flow will obtain on dual structures rather than on a single structure, since the more than 25% of the passenger cars which turn to go south on Mt. Vernon Memorial Highway, turn left in the direction in which they are bound, with the necessity of moving in or of turning into the outside right hand lane in which trucks and other commercial vehicles are moving.

It is a known fact that this artery, of which this bridge is a part, carries as high a percentage of commercial traffic as any other highway in the United States.

You may have wondered why I mentioned the senses of hearing and smell. Again, if one aim of modern highway design is to make driving pleasant, then why build an 8-lane bridge with at least 96 feet of pavement, a 5-foot separating strip, and two twelve-foot sidewalks, a total of about 127 feet of paved surface? Think of those who are in vehicles on the 4 middle lanes, some of whom will be entering Washington for the first time! They are likely to be pretty thoroughly asphixiated in the clouds of fumes from the Diesel engines of trucks and from the gasoline fumes of motor cars. The attendent noise and the feeling of a crowded thoroughfare is certainly not conducive to pleasure, in fact, such an environment, though existing for only a few brief minutes, would be singularly inappropriate upon entering the Nation's Capital. Finally, consideration should be given to the appearance and to the effect of 127 feet of glaring hot pavement in Washington's summers!

These and many other factors have led the Commission of Fine Arts to favor the construction of bridges to take the place of the old one at 14th Street and the Potomac.

Please pardon me for not acknowledging personally your letter dated August 17th, which arrived while I was on the Pacific Coast on business. Be assured, however, that the Commission of Fine Arts are anxious to cooperate in every possible manner to the end that this project may be eminently worthy of the City of Washington.

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman

c. c. General Grant
Mr. T. L. MacDonald
Mr. Joseph Barnett

COPY

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

WASHINGTON

February 21, 1944.

Mrs. Charles E. Greenough
The University Club
1 West 54th Street
New York City

My dear Mrs. Greenough:

The President referred your letter of January 24 to this office. The delay in this acknowledgment was occasioned by the fact that I wished to refer the matter to the Commission at the next meeting subsequent to the receipt of your communication. This was done on Friday, February 18.

The Commission regret that they are not inclined to recommend the acquisition by the Government of the painting depicting the Pocahontas incident. Upon investigation we find that no funds are available with which to acquire the painting by purchase; in fact, the large majority of the paintings in the collection of the Smithsonian Institution are presented by doners without cost to the Government.

Very truly yours,

FOR THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman

Exhibit H

COPY FOR THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

The Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, The Commission of Fine Arts, and Miss Katharine N. Rhoades, as provided in Paragraph 4 of the Codicil to the Will of the late Charles L. Freer, have examined the following objects:

1 Gilt bronze figure, (double Buddhist figure). Chinese, Six Dynasties.

1 Bronze Buddhist figure. Chinese, Six Dynasties.

1 Painting. Chinese, Yuan dynasty, by Chao Yung.

1 Porcelain bowl. Chinese, Ch'ien Lung period.

1 Pottery vase. Chinese, Sui, or early T'ang dynasty.

1 Porcelain vase. Chinese, Yung Cheng period.

1 Porcelain bowl. Chinese, Sung dynasty, Yin ching.

1 Manuscript. Armenian, dated 1648 A.D. The Gospel according to the four Evangelists.

1 Manuscript. Persian, 16th century. A collection in 1 Volume of the 7 books of the poems of Jami.

1 Manuscript. Persian. An Anthology containing painting attributed to Behzad.

1 Painting. Persian. Page from a Bestiary Ms. (Bird on a branch).

1 Painting. Persian. Page from a Bestiary Ms. (Three birds flying).

1 Painting. Persian. Leaf from a ms. of the Shahnamah.

which have been recommended for purchase for the Freer Gallery of Art by Mr. A. G. Wenley, Director, and they hereby approve the purchase.

For the Regents of the
Smithsonian Institution.

Gilmore D. Clarke, Chairman,
For the Commission of Fine Arts.

February 18th, 1944.

Katharine N. Rhoades.

Exhibit I

February 22, 1944.

Dear Mr. Rowan:

Your letter of February 15th, concerning the full-size models of two proposed sculpture figures by Mr. Henry Kreis to flank the mural painting in the lobby of the War Department Building at Twenty-first Street and Virginia Avenue, received the attention of the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on February 18, 1944. Consideration was given to the elevation drawing, which you presented at the meeting.

In order that the Commission of Fine Arts may determine the proper position of these figures in relation to the painting, please arrange with Mr. Kreis to have him send the models to Washington, so that the Commission may see them in place at the next meeting.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Mr. Edward B. Rowan,
Assistant Chief,
Section of Fine Arts,
Public Buildings Administration,
Federal Works Agency,
Washington, D. C.

Exhibit J

NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

INTERIOR BUILDING

WASHINGTON, D. C.

February 21, 1944

Mr. H. P. Caemmerer
Secretary
The Commission of Fine Arts
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. Caemmerer:

I have your note of February 19, 1944, in which you request a copy of the President's letter which was read at the dinner meeting on February 18. Also, Mr. Peaslee has just informed me that you desire a copy of Mr. Ickes' letter.

I take pleasure in complying with your requests, and a copy of each is enclosed.

Sincerely yours,

U. S. GRANT, 3rd
Major General, U. S. Army
Chairman

Enclosures - 2

Exhibit K

NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

INTERIOR BUILDING

WASHINGTON, D. C.

February 23, 1944

Mr. H. P. Caemmerer
Secretary
The Commission of Fine Arts
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. Caemmerer:

I have your note of February 19, 1944, in which you request a copy of the President's letter which was read at the dinner meeting on February 18. Also, Mr. Pegalee has just informed me that you desire a copy of Mr. Ickes' letter.

I take pleasure in complying with your requests, and a copy of each is enclosed.

Sincerely yours,

U. S. GRANT, 3rd
Major General, U. S. Army
Chairman

Enclosures - 2

Exhibit F

COPY

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

February 12, 1944.

Dear Mr. Zantzinger:

I have great pleasure in extending hearty greetings to all who attend the dinner meeting of the Joint Committee on the National Capital on February eighteenth.

The agencies of government are aware of the patriotic efforts of the various professions and civic groups which, during the past four decades, have focused our attention upon shortcomings and possibilities in the planning and development of the Federal city and have spurred us on to action. It may not be fully realized, however, that the government has received years of devoted service from the ablest men in the arts and professions.

As unpaid members of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, some of them have helped to impress us with the need of unified planning and steadfast adherence to plan; and on the Commission of Fine Arts, they have insured the highest standards in the execution of our buildings and monuments. Your procedure in bringing together, in one committee of committees, representatives of ten major organizations indicates that the two commissions may count on them for assistance in solving special problems and for sympathetic understanding in interpreting Washington to the public.

This Federal city of ours belongs to all of us and merits our best united efforts in order that it may be recognized as an outstanding example of what a capital should be -- the highest expression of our culture.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

C. C. Zantzinger, Esq.,
Chairman,
Joint Committee on the National Capital,
1531 Locust Street,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

February 12, 1944.

Dear Mr. Zantzinger:

I have great pleasure in extending hearty greetings to all who attend the dinner meeting of the Joint Committee on the National Capital on February eighteenth.

The agencies of government are aware of the patriotic efforts of the various professions and civic groups which, during the past four decades, have focused our attention upon shortcomings and possibilities in the planning and development of the Federal city and have spurred us on to action. It may not be fully realized, however, that the government has received years of devoted service from the ablest men in the arts and professions.

As unpaid members of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, some of them have helped to impress us with the need of unified planning and steadfast adherence to plan; and on the Commission of Fine Arts, they have insured the highest standards in the execution of our buildings and monuments. Your procedure in bringing together, in one committee of committees, representatives of ten major organizations indicates that the two commissions may count on them for assistance in solving special problems and for sympathetic understanding in interpreting Washington to the public.

This Federal city of ours belongs to all of us and merits our best united efforts in order that it may be recognized as an outstanding example of what a capital should be -- the highest expression of our culture.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

C. C. Zantzinger, Esq.,
Chairman,
Joint Committee on the National Capital,
1531 Locust Street,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

COPY

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Washington

February 16, 1944

My dear General Grant:

I really want to come to that dinner on Friday night at the Mayflower Hotel but I now know that I must not. I am so desperately tired that I am only working a half a day this week, and not very vigorously at that. If I can get away from Washington before Friday night, I shall do so.

I wanted to attend the dinner not only because you asked me, but because I am genuinely interested in Washington. Whether they are mistaken or not, I have some views on what we should try to make out of Washington and the Washington area physically and this would have been a chance that I have wanted to express them.

You have been very generous in asking me and I know that you will forgive me for this lapse.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Harold L. Ickes

Secretary of the Interior

Major General U. S. Grant, 3rd
Chairman, National Capital Park
and Planning Commission
Interior Building
Washington, D. C.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Washington

February 16, 1944

My dear General Grant:

I really want to come to that dinner on Friday night at the Mayflower Hotel but I now know that I must not. I am so desperately tired that I am only working a half a day this week, and not very vigorously at that. If I can get away from Washington before Friday night, I shall do so.

I wanted to attend the dinner not only because you asked me, but because I am genuinely interested in Washington. Whether they are mistaken or not, I have some views on what we should try to make out of Washington and the Washington area physically and this would have been a chance that I have wanted to express them.

You have been very generous in asking me and I know that you will forgive me for this lapse.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Harold L. Ickes

Secretary of the Interior

Major General U. S. Grant, 3rd
Chairman, National Capital Park
and Planning Commission
Interior Building
Washington, D. C.

Extract from Speech by Major General Philip B. Fleming, Administrator, Federal Works Agency, at Dinner, Mayflower Hotel, February 18, 1944.

Washington is the hub for four routes of the proposed inter-regional system of highways. One of the routes would extend northward in the direction of Baltimore, one northwestward, one southwestward, and one southward in the direction of Richmond.

Specific locations of these routes, both in Washington and at the approaches to the District of Columbia, have not yet been determined. Highway authorities in the District are therefore conducting many studies of locations and improvements for the inter-regional routes through Washington, as well as for other post-war highway developments in the city.

Of the Federal money made available by Congress in November, 1941, and again in July, 1943, for planning post-war highway improvements in the various States, the share of the District of Columbia totaled more than $226,000. This together with the required matching District funds has enabled the District to program more than $453,000 of investigations, surveys, and advance engineering with Federal aid.

These programmed planning projects and others on which the District is making preliminary surveys cover construction estimated to cost more than $26,000,000. Other similar projects in the Washington metropolitan area which are under the supervision of Maryland and Virginia highway authorities represent additional construction which would cost approximately $5,000,000. So there is $31,000,000 of post-war construction in view in the metropolitan area. This total includes the Shirley Memorial Highway in southeastern Fairfax County, Va., although most of this is not strictly in the metropolitan area.

In the District of Columbia, more than $10,000,000 of construction is being planned to make K Street a crosstown throughway. The design has already been completed for the construction of an elevated highway between the north end of Key Bridge in Georgetown to connect with present improvements on K Street at Rock Creek. The estimated cost of this elevated structure is $2,200,000.

Between Rock Creek and 21st Street, N. W., K Street will be reconstructed as a depressed highway at an estimated cost of $2,500,000. The design for this project is 5 percent complete.

From 12th Street, N. W., to North Capitol Street, K Street will be depressed, passing by subway through Mount Vernon Square, the site of the D. C. Public Library. The subway construction will cost about $3,400,000, and the remainder of the section about 2,300,000. Consultants are now being secured to make the preliminary analysis and development of this depressed route. Surveys are 10 percent complete.

Another ambitious project in the District calls for a new $7,000,000 bridge across the Potomac at approximately the location of the present 14th Street Bridge. The new bridge will actually be two bridges, according to present plans---one for each direction of travel. Each bridge will be four lanes wide. Surveys are 50 percent complete.

Extract from Speech by Major General Philip B. Fleming, Administrator, Federal Works Agency, at Dinner, Mayflower Hotel, February 18, 1944.

Washington is the hub for four routes of the proposed inter-regional system of highways. One of the routes would extend northward in the direction of Baltimore, one northwestward, one southwestward, and one southward in the direction of Richmond.

Specific locations of these routes, both in Washington and at the approaches to the District of Columbia, have not yet been determined. Highway authorities in the District are therefore conducting many studies of locations and improvements for the inter-regional routes through Washington, as well as for other post-war highway developments in the city.

Of the Federal money made available by Congress in November, 1941, and again in July, 1943, for planning post-war highway improvements in the various States, the share of the District of Columbia totaled more than $225,000. This together with the required matching District funds has enabled the District to program more than $400,000 of investigations, surveys, and advance engineering with Federal aid.

These programmed planning projects and others on which the District is making preliminary surveys cover construction estimated to cost more than $25,000,000. Other similar projects in the Washington metropolitan area which are under the supervision of Maryland and Virginia highway authorities represent additional construction which would cost approximately $5,000,000. So there is $31,000,000 of post-war construction in view in the metropolitan area. This total includes the Shirley Memorial Highway in southeastern Fairfax County, Va., although most of this is not strictly in the metropolitan area.

In the District of Columbia, more than $10,000,000 of construction is being planned to make K Street a crosstown throughway. The design has already been completed for the construction of an elevated highway between the north end of Key Bridge in Georgetown to connect with present improvements on K Street at Rock Creek. The estimated cost of this elevated structure is $2,200,000.

Between Rock Creek and 21st Street, N. W., K Street will be reconstructed as a depressed highway at an estimated cost of $2,500,000. The design for this project is 5 percent complete.

From 12th Street, N. W., to North Capitol Street, K Street will be depressed, passing by subway through Mount Vernon Square, the site of the D. C. Public Library. The subway construction will cost about $3,400,000, and the remainder of the section about 2,300,000. Consultants are now being secured to make the preliminary analysis and development of this depressed route. Surveys are 10 percent complete.

Another ambitious project in the District calls for a new $7,000,000 bridge across the Potomac at approximately the location of the present 14th Street Bridge. The new bridge will actually be two bridges, according to present plans---one for each direction of travel. Each bridge will be four lanes wide. Surveys are 50 percent complete.

The third major project for post-war construction is a $4,500,000 bridge over the Anacostia River on South Capitol Street. This structure, now almost fully designed, will provide an important crossing for the considerable development in southeast Washington in recent years. It will also connect with roads to Suitland and Camp Springs where the Government has made extensive improvements. The existing Anacostia Bridge at the Navy Yard has become increasingly inadequate in capacity as the city has expanded to the southeast, its alignment is poor, and its approach roads are narrow.

A fourth major post-war project is an underpass at Dupont Circle. Design for this construction is 80 percent complete. It will cost about $1,250,000.

A great many lesser projects are under consideration in the District. The more important of these include two underpasses at street intersections with the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. Each of these will cost about $200,000. One is located on Riggs Road and the other on Kansas Avenue, both in the northeastern quarter of the city.

Washington is rapidly becoming, if not already so, the greatest capital city in the world. To reach this eminence it has been favored by many natural factors, not the least of which is that the United States is a new nation. Washington was designed from its start as a National Capital and the original concept has not been forgotten. This places grave responsibility upon those agencies required to locate and design Federal buildings. It requires complete and cordial relationships between the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, the Fine Arts Commission, the Architect of the Capitol, the Public Buildings Administration, and the District Government. Happily, this cooperation is close and intimate.

It is well appreciated by everyone that a single badly placed and badly designed building could well affect an entire composition of structures. It becomes necessary, therefore, that every structure must fit an over-all pattern based upon requirements fifty years hence. That pattern is now developing. Only by so doing can there be assured a balanced growth of Federal structures and which affect, and in turn are affected by, distribution of places of living and transit.

The extent of post-war construction in the District of Columbia is not clear. One of the numerous unknown factors in the equation is the future size of the military establishments. Also, it is not known to what extent the groups moved out of Washington under the decentralization program will desire to return to Washington. There has begun to emerge, however, some basic considerations.

The Federal Works Agency is strongly committed to the principle that, as quickly as war conditions will permit and permanent construction undertaken, all Federal structures on the Mall--including the Munitions and the Navy Buildings---shall be removed. This requires further analysis of structures to house the Navy Department. Prior to the War, preliminary drawings were made for a new Navy Department building, but the impact of the War and the increased size of the Navy resulting therefrom will, in the post-war period, require a larger structure than previously planned. Funds are now held in reserve for a new building for the General Accounting Office and for the west central heating plant in Georgetown, the foundations of which are now in place. No other funds

The third major project for post-war construction is a $4,500,000 bridge over the Anacostia River on South Capitol Street. This structure, now almost fully designed, will provide an important crossing for the considerable development in southeast Washington in recent years. It will also connect with roads to Suitland and Camp Springs where the Government has made extensive improvements. The existing Anacostia Bridge at the Navy Yard has become increasingly inadequate in capacity as the city has expanded to the southeast, its alignment is poor, and its approach roads are narrow.

A fourth major post-war project is an underpass at Dupont Circle. Design for this construction is 80 percent complete. It will cost about $1,250,000.

A great many lesser projects are under consideration in the District. The more important of these include two underpasses at street intersections with the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. Each of these will cost about $300,000. One is located on Rigg Road and the other on Kansas Avenue, both in the northwestern quarter of the city.

Washington is rapidly becoming, if not already so, the greatest capital city in the world. To reach this eminence it has been favored by many natural factors, not the least of which is that the United States is a new nation. Washington was designed from its start as a National Capital and the original concept has not been forgotten. This places grave responsibility upon those agencies required to locate and design Federal buildings. It requires complete and careful relationships between the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, the Fine Arts Commission, the Architect of the Capitol, the Public Buildings Administration, and the District Government. Happily, this cooperation is close and intimate.

It is well appreciated by everyone that a single badly placed and badly designed building could well affect an entire composition of structures. It becomes necessary, therefore, that every structure must fit an over-all pattern based upon requirements fifty years hence. That pattern is now developing. Only by so doing can there be assured a balanced growth of Federal structures and which affect, and in turn are affected by, distribution of places of living and transit.

The extent of post-war construction in the District of Columbia is not clear. One of the numerous unknown factors in the equation is the future size of the military establishments. Also, it is not known to what extent the groups moved out of Washington under the decentralization program will desire to return to Washington. There has begun to emerge, however, some basic considerations.

The Federal Works Agency is strongly committed to the principle that, as quickly as war conditions will permit and permanent construction undertaken, all Federal structures on the Mall--including the Munitions and the Navy buildings---shall be removed. This requires further analysis of structures to house the Navy Department. Prior to the war, preliminary drawings were made for a new Navy Department building, but the impact of the war and the increased size of the Navy resulting therefrom will, in the post-war period, require a larger structure than previously planned. Funds are now held in reserve for a new building for the General Accounting Office and for the west central heating plant in Georgetown, the foundations of which are now in place. No other funds

are available.

The general impression prevails that there will be an excess of Federal space in Washington in the post-war period. This assumption is incorrect, when it is realized the the Federal Government was renting approximately three million square feet of space in the District of Columbia prior to the War. It is true that since then the Pentagon Building has been constructed but, due to the increased peace-time activities of the War Department, it will only replace the Munitions Building and some relatively unimportant structures. Also, with respect to the General Accounting Office building, this again does not relieve the primary space situation, as the new building--unless enlarged--will be much too small to house that Agency.

It is manifest that new construction in the District should be started in the early post-war period. This will require sympathetic cooperation between all groups that have a vital responsibility in this problem. If past experience is a guide, this will be a stimulating experience.

are available.

The general impression prevails that there will be no change of
federal space in Washington in the post-war period. This assumption is
incorrect, when it is realized the federal Government was requiring
approximately three million square feet of space in the District of
Columbia prior to the War. It is time that since the Pentagon Building
has been constructed but, due to the increased peace-time activities of the
War Department, it will only replace the Munitions Building and some relatively
unimportant structures. Also, with respect to the General Accounting Office
Building, this again does not relieve the primary space situation, as the new
building--unless enlarged--will be much too small to house that Agency.

It is manifest that new construction in the District should be started in
the early post-war period. This will require symphetic cooperation between
all groups that have a vital responsibility in this problem. If past
experience is a guide, this will be a stimulating experience.

AESTHETIC STANDARDS FOR THE NATIONAL CAPITAL

Address by Gilmore D. Clarke, Chairman of the National Commission of Fine Arts, before the Members and Guests of the Joint Committee on the National Capital, Washington, D. C., Friday, February 18, 1944.

An eminent Justice of the New York State Court of Appeals, in a majority decision ordering the removal of a large and particularly offensive billboard erected on the approach to an important bridge across the Hudson River, wrote in part that "beauty may not be a queen, but she is not an outcast beyond the pale of protection and respect. She may at least shelter herself under the wing of safety, morality, or decency." The Commission of Fine Arts, established by Congress in 1910, has taken an active part in the development of the National Capital and formulated a continuing artistic policy ever recognizing Beauty as Queen.

As a result of the partial and even total destruction of many of the capitals of Europe, Washington now takes a place preeminent, a position which must be maintained throughout the subsequent years. It is the artistic eminence of this City which chiefly concerns the Commission of Fine Arts, embracing as it does the design of public buildings, of parks, and of bridges, as well as the appropriate embellishment of these constituent elements with the art of the sculptor and of the painter.

During the last decade the Commission have witnessed material changes in the general character of artistic creation, particularly within the field of architecture; changes in our economic and in our social life are clearly manifest in every phase of human endeavor. Insofar as the National Capital is concerned, changes in architectural expression fortunately have been gradual for, as you are fully aware, the Commission have not sanctioned the abandonment of the classic background which was the basis for rebuilding the City in the years of its

renaissance, stimulated by the Senate Park Commission in 1901. While recently we have not invited the incorporation of those details on buildings, which particularly distinguish Greek and Roman monuments, we have urged adherence to beauty of form, to excellence of proportions and to permanence of materials, all attributes of design exemplary of the art of the architecture of the past. These attributes, we believe, must continue to dominate the design of our important governmental structures as well as of certain other buildings erected as important elements in the great unfinished fabric which is Washington. In some of the finest buildings of the Capital the architects departed from a slavish adherence to details represented in classic forms but, nevertheless, followed the fundamental basic principles of design which guided the artistic leaders of the Greek and Roman Worlds and of the Renaissance. For example, no one, to my knowledge, has ever expressed the opinion that the home of the National Academy of Sciences by the late Bertram G. Goodhue or the Folger Shakespeare Library by Paul P. Cret are incongruous in the Washington scene. Thus, as architectural designs are simplified, we make room for rich embellishment by sculptor and by painter and thus provide a greater distinction in our buildings, a distinction which will tend to make them wholly American in their flavor. The strict and rigid compliance with the tenets of the classical school in architecture, which have obtained altogether too long in Washington, must be abandoned in favor of a more fresh approach to the problems which will confront the designers of new buildings in the future.

I wish I had time to tell you of some of the monstrosities and of ill-considered projects which the Commission of Fine Arts have prevented over a period of more than three decades. These preventive accomplishments may be said to lie

buried in the files; they constitute the records of disapproval of all manner of unsuitable and inappropriate designs which, fortunately, will never be realized. Many of these grave errors would have changed materially the face of this City had they taken form in stone, in mortar, and in steel. The most notable among the recent examples of preventive action was the decision by the President of the United States, on the recommendation of the Fine Arts, and Planning Commissions to change the proposed site for the Pentagon Building from the location first proposed in Arlington, on the extension of the axis of the Mall west of the Potomac, to a position three-quarters of a mile South. This action prevented the construction of this huge building in an area originally designated as part of the National Cemetery and now so dedicated.

Through authority granted under the Shipstead-Luce Act, approved by Congress in 1930, the Commission of Fine Arts exert an effective control over the design of all buildings erected on private property bordering upon certain of the public lands of the Capital, and consequently they have prevented the construction of many buildings and other structures which would have destroyed utterly the dignity of the Central Composition and of the lands bordering upon Rock Creek Park. Our methods of control at all times have been reasonable so that to date it has been unnecessary to test this Act in the Courts. Now, after fourteen years' trial, it appears that reasonable aesthetic control over private building development is most likely to be held a constitutional right of government, not only in Washington, but in other cities as well.

In the period postwar we look forward to the demolition of all temporary buildings erected for this War, as well as the so-called "temporary structures" erected along Constitution Avenue during the early days of the last conflict,

to the end that Washington may once again take on an atmosphere of great dignity becoming its importance as the Capital of this Nation. We are prepared to aid the Congress in solving the inevitable problem of War Memorials, and to assist the appropriate agencies of the Government in carrying out a program of construction of public works aimed to fulfil certain needs of this City and to serve also as a means whereby many of the men of this community, now in the Armed Forces and in war industry, may find employment during a period of from 18 months to two years after the cessation of hostilities, while business and industry are being geared to take up the full burden of employment.

We shall aid in the protection of the majestic Valley of the Potomac, to beyond Great Falls, against encroachments incompatible with the best uses of this area. Articles in the public press have indicated that plans are contemplated which, if carried out, would forever destroy the artistic integrity of the valley. Even a compromise scheme is undesirable here; we cannot build dams, no matter how well done, and at the same time continue to enjoy the beauty of this indispensible asset of the Nation's Capital. The Commission of Fine Arts took an important part in defeating the last attempt to despoil this single remaining untouched remnant of Nature's achievement in this region, and we shall continue to advocate the full protection of this magnificent valley for enjoyment by future generations of Americans.

Finally, we shall continue to follow our policy of close collaboration with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and with other agencies, both public and private, in an effort to promote every action aimed to protect and to enhance the beauty and the convenience of this City and its environs to the end that it may forever stand unexcelled among the capitals of the world.